

THE PHILOSOPHICAL NARRATIVE OF VLADIMIR SOLOVYOV

An Application of Narrative Analysis to Russian Classical Philosophy: a Case-Study of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* and Other Works by Vladimir Solovyov

Een wetenschappelijke proeve op het gebied der Wijsbegeerte

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de
Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, volgens besluit
van het College van Decanen in het openbaar
verdedigd op Oktober 2002 des namiddags om 15:30

Igor Smerdov

Geboren op 19 november 1967 te Gorky (Nizhny Novgorod),
Rusland

Promotor: Prof. Dr. Machiel L.J. Karskens
co-promotor: Dr. Evert van der Zweerde

Nijmegen 2002

Manuscript committee:

Prof. dr. W. Weststeijn

Prof. dr. Ph. van Haute

Dr. A. Simons

In this book I analyze the philosophical narrative of the great Russian philosopher, Vladimir Solovyov (1853-1900). My analysis is based on his The «Crisis of Western Philosophy» as well as other works. The book provides an introductory assessment of the narrative method as it can be applied to Russian classical philosophy. The work includes a bibliography of publications in English, Russian and other languages, on the problems of Russian philosophy and narrative analysis. The book is intended for readers interested in Russian philosophy and narrative method.

В книге рассматриваются особенности философского повествования великого русского философа Владимира Соловьева (1853-1900) на примере его ранней работы «Кризис западной философии» и некоторых других. Книга носит характер введения в проблематику нарративного анализа и применения его к текстам русской классической философии. Книга снабжена библиографией русскоязычных и иностранных источников по философии Соловьева и нарративному анализу. Данное исследование окажется полезным философам, филологам, культурологам и всем, кто интересуется русской философией и методологией анализа философских текстов.

© Igor Smerdov, 2002

CONTENTS

Preface	5
Introduction	7
Purposes and Tasks	11
Chapter 1. Towards a Model for the Narrative Analysis	
of Philosophical Texts	15
1.1. Narrative Approach and Philosophic Text.	
A Methodological Introduction and Foundation	15
1.2. The Necessity of a Methodological Turn in Scholarly Works	
on Vl.Solovyov	41
1.3. Advantages and Disadvantages of the Narrative Approach	56
1.4. Reflections on the Method of this Work	58
1.5. Conclusions	61
Chapter 2. The Crisis of Western Philosophy	
as History of Philosophy	63
2.1. Reception of <i>The Crisis of Western Philosophy</i>	63
2.2. Topic and Composition of the Text	74
2.3. Solovyov's Account of the History of Western Philosophy	80
2.4. The Functions of the Characters in Solovyov's Narrative	85
2.5. Novelistic Narration in <i>The Crisis of Western Philosophy</i>	98
2.6. Individual Portraits of Philosophers in <i>The Crisis</i>	
<i>of Western Philosophy</i>	105
2.7. The Rhetorical Figure of Parallelism and Comparison	
in History of Philosophy	111
2.8. Forms of Narrative and Points of View in <i>The Crisis</i>	116
2.9. The Positivists in <i>The Crisis</i>	118
2.10. Anti-positivistic Irony in <i>The Crisis of Western</i>	
<i>Philosophy</i>	121
2.11. The Permanent Motif in <i>The Crisis of Western Philosophy</i>	123
2.12. Metaphors in <i>The Crisis of Western Philosophy</i>	125
2.13. Questions in <i>The Crisis of Western Philosophy</i>	128
2.14. Forms of Representation of History and the Historical	
in <i>The Crisis</i>	130
2.15. A Synthetic Model of Narrative Analysis	134
2.16. Conclusions	138

Chapter 3. Further Development of the Primary System of Narrative in Solovyov's Works	140
3.1. Choice of Solovyov's Works and Preliminary Remarks	140
3.2. Religion as Key Idea or Centre of Narration in Solovyov's Major Works	141
3.3. Schemes in <i>The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge</i>	144
3.4. The Engaging Mode of Writing in <i>Lectures on Divine Humanity</i>	152
3.5. The Authoritative Character and its Role in Solovyov's Narrative	164
3.6. The Dialogue Form in Solovyov's <i>Three Conversations</i>	169
3.7. Conclusions	177
General Conclusion	179
Bibliography	184
Titles in Russian	194

Preface

I would like to thank all the teachers and colleagues without whom this book would have never been published. In particular, I am grateful to my school teacher in Nizhny Novgorod, Ella Pak, for her encouragement to write a dissertation, to my first advisor, Vsevolod Grekhnyov (Nizhny Novgorod State University), for inspiration, and to Svetlana Dolova for her help in preparation of the book. I would like to thank my teachers and colleagues at the Institute for European Cultures (Moscow) for their help and interest, in particular Galina Zvereva, Tatyana Dashkova, Boris Stepanov, Arkady Perlov, and also Vyacheslav Serbinenko (Russian State University for the Humanities) as well as all my colleagues and friends from the IEC.

I am grateful to my advisors and colleagues from the Catholic University of Nijmegen, my supervisor and co-promotor Evert van der Zweerde, promotor Machiel Karskens, also Wil van der Bercken, Manon de Courten, Anton Simons, Pauline Schrooyen for their help and suggestions. I am also grateful to my British colleagues Philip Boobbyer and Jonathan Sutton. I would like to express my thanks to Wendy Helleman (Canada), Harley Wagler (USA), Christine Karrer (Switzerland/USA), Rachel Hayes (UK) for their help with the English text.

INTRODUCTION

In this introductory section, I want to outline my method, explain my reasons for making such an inquiry, and elaborate what we can learn from it. First of all, the narrative approach presupposes “close reading” of the text and is based on an inquiry of a concrete text. My analysis is indeed based on close reading, but beyond that I am also making “an interpretation of interpretation”.¹ However, my interpretation is aimed at finding traditional aesthetic beauty, rather than contradictions, vague statements or lack of meaning in the text of the Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyov (1853–1900). This project, which I have called “narrative analysis”, is more favorably disposed towards the text as a whole, than is typical of deconstruction. Deconstructive analysis is aimed at search of inner contradictions, “concealed meanings in the text, unnoted by the “naïve” reader and the author himself, and inherited from discursive practices of the past”.² On the contrary, the narrative approach focuses on literary and artistic elements of the text. It also approximates Kenneth Burke’s rhetorical analysis of what he calls “symbolic acts”, although Burke has concentrated on literary or *publicistika* texts.³

¹ Derrida J. Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences // Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader /Edited by David Lodge/ – London and New York: Longman, 1988. – p. 122.

² Ильин И.П. Постмодернизм. Словарь терминов – М.: ИНИОН РАН, Интрада, 2001. – С.56. (Ilyin I. Postmodernism. Dictionary of Terms) Ilyin quotes Anthony Easthope who used the term “deconstruction” in five ways: “(1) A criticism designed to challenge the realistic mode in which a text aims to naturalize itself by demonstrating its actual constructedness. (2) A Foucauldian context, a procedure for revealing the inter-discursive dependencies of a discourse. (3) The project of annihilating the category of “Literature” by uncovering the discursive and institutional practices that uphold it. (4) American deconstruction which aims to discover how a text always differs from itself in a critical reading whose own text, through self-reflexive irony, aims towards a similar undecidability and aporia. (5) Derridean deconstruction: a critical analysis of inherited binary opposition in which a left-hand term claims privilege through its denigration of the right-hand term”. (Easthope A. British Post-structuralism since 1968 – London and New York: Routledge, 1988. – p. 187).

³ “We might sum all this up by saying that poetry, or any verbal act, is to be considered as “symbolic action There are practical acts, and there are symbolic acts The symbolic act is the dancing of an attitude”. (Burke K. The Philosophy of Literary Form. Studies in Symbolic Action – New York: Vintage Books, 1957. – pp. 8–9) Burke’s analysis of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* is rather a rhetorical analysis of Hitler’s rhetoric and magic. (Burke K. The Rhetoric of Hitler’s “Battle” // The

I have chosen the name “narrative analysis”, rather than rhetorical, poetic, textual or discourse analysis because, in my opinion, the term “narrative” covers all of them.⁴ The analysis of rhetoric presupposes that some non-rhetorical elements are disregarded, while textual analysis is a Barthean concept of decoding text, and also disregards elements which are not purely textual, such as polemics or reader response to the published text. The term “discourse analysis” covers approximately the same meanings, but it is associated with spoken discourse and conversation.⁵ Genette’s discourse “contains all the features that the writer adds to the story, especially changes of time sequence, the presentation of the consciousness of the characters, and the narrator’s relation to the story and the audience”.⁶ Following Wallace Martin’s choice of the term “narrative” for my analysis, I believe that Solovyov’s *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, the focus of the present study, has also influenced my process of selection; narrative analysis is appropriate for the text which I shall analyze.

Because my narrative approach is post-structuralist, I pay attention to all elements of the text (poetic, rhetoric, argumentative) as they come up as a result of close reading. I do not imply a structure of concepts in order to find, in turn, a structure in a chosen text.

Philosophy of Literary Form – pp. 164–189) Of course, Burke’s purpose is to expose Hitler’s rhetorical tricks and speculations, “to discover what kind of “medicine” this medicine-man has concocted,” and it is rather an extremely critical position. I often use the same literary and rhetorical terminology as Burke does. But there is a major difference between Burke’s and my analysis. He exposes rhetorical tricks. I expose rhetorical elements as beauty. It is a question of attitude (in the case of Hitler’s theoretical work, Burke’s attitude may be warranted) and of naming the results of rhetorical analysis.

⁴ My special concern is the relation between rhetoric and poetics. Kenneth Burke distinguished rhetoric from poetics by saying that “rhetoric was developed by the use of language for purpose of cooperation and competition. It serves to form appropriate attitudes that were designed to induce corresponding acts But Poetics could still be concerned with symbolic action for its own sake, without references to purposes in the practical, nonartistic realm”. “The two fields readily become confused, because there is a large area which they share in common. Also, although some works lend themselves more readily to treatment in terms of Rhetoric than in terms of Poetics, or vice versa, even a work of science can be shown to have some Rhetorical or Poetic ingredients”. (Burke K. *Rhetoric and Poetics* // Burke K. *Language as Symbolic Action. Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* – Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966. – pp. 296, 302).

⁵ Coulthard M. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* – New York: Longman, 1985. – p. 1. See also chapter *Conversational Analysis* (Ibid. pp. 59–95).

⁶ Martin W. *Recent Theories of Narrative* – Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986. – 108 p.

This study as a whole is divided into three parts. They may be denoted as (1) the elaboration of a model of narrative analysis of a philosophical text, using different methods and practices from textual (literary and rhetorical) studies according to the principle “anything goes”, (2) the application of this model as a case-study of Vladimir Solovyov’s *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, and (3) the outline of further case-studies, extending the model of narrative analysis to other texts of Solovyov and, potentially, to any text in Russian philosophy. Even where the results of the application of narrative method are not very impressive, it does clarify the limits and capabilities of the method as such, and this is still a valuable result.

According to the aforementioned division, in chapter 1 I present the narrative method as I use it, and outline its application to philosophy in sections 1.1–1.2. In section 1.3 I discuss the important recent achievements as to methods and vision in Solovyov studies, in order to show the obvious shift from general doxographical, biographical, and historiographical approaches to studies of either separate works by Solovyov or narrow case-studies. I also discuss recent studies of aesthetic and literary elements in Solovyov’s works appearing in the Russian and Western academic world. In section 1.4 I assess the advantages and disadvantages of a narrative approach as supplementary to the long tradition of Solovyov studies.

In chapter 2 I analyze in detail the poetic and rhetorical elements of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, the first major work of Solovyov, his Master’s dissertation defended in 1874. Neither the content of this work, from the beginning of Chapter I to the end of Chapter V, nor the functions of the characters, different types of narration, Solovyov’s account of the history of philosophy, rhetorical figures, points of view, motifs, metaphors and other tropes have yet received adequate analysis.⁷

Chapter 3 deals with artistic elements in other works of Solovyov, such as *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*, *Lectures on Divine Humanity*, *The Justification of the Good*, and *Three Conversations*. I also trace the return and transformation of some features of Solovyov’s narration. It thus offers an analysis of so-called “poetics of philosophy”.⁸

⁷ The only article, which gives a survey of the content of *The Crisis* in connection to Hegel, is Kline G. Hegel and Solovyov // Hegel and the History of Philosophy. Proceedings of the 1972 Hegel Society in America Conference /ed. by J. O’Malley and others/ – The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974. – pp. 161-163. I discuss this article in section 1.3.

⁸ Usually, poetics is understood as a discipline that “deals with problems of verbal structures, just as the analysis of painting is concerned with pictorial struc-

The novelty of my study is that it offers an interpretation and interpretative approach to *The Crisis* (and other texts) which is new and supplementary: I investigate and describe the narrative mechanisms and tropes in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. My study is the first monograph about a work of Solovyov in “Solovyoviana” (an informal name for the tradition of study of Solovyov’s life, works and their connections to Russian intellectual history). I describe which narrative structure lies at the basis of this text, and what makes this text attractive and interesting to the reader. I then extend the results of this investigation to a few later, major texts of Solovyov. I think this is very appropriate for Solovyov in particular, because this extremely gifted systematic philosopher spent most of his life as a freelance writer; accordingly “Solovyoviana” provides an appropriate test area for the synthesis of literary studies and philosophical methods.

As a result of my study, I hope to create a new perspective in Solovyov studies and a new vision of his philosophical texts as examples not only of elaboration of a clear universal philosophical doctrine (integral knowledge, All-unity, etc.), but as texts with a significant artistic, poetic, and rhetoric element. I believe that this literary element is an unalienable part of Solovyov’s philosophical writing. A traditional approach to Solovyov’s cognitive strategy in his philosophical works does not allow for such results.

tures”. Jakobson R. Linguistics and Poetics // Jakobson R. Selected Writing in 5 vols., vol. 3, Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry – The Hague: Mouton Press, 1981. – p. 18 (The first Russian edition: // Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика // Структурализм: “за” и “против” – М.: Прогресс, 1975. – С.193). See also the definition of poetics: “ce qu’elle étudie n’est pas la poésie ou la littérature mais la “poécité” et la “littéarité” in the book: Todorov T. Poétique de la prose – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1971. – p. 46. Such a definition of poetics allows me to apply its principles to any verbal text, including philosophical ones, as Hayden White did for historiographical texts in the Introduction to his Metahistory called “The Poetics of History”. (White H. Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe – London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – pp. 1-42).

I understand “poetics of philosophy” in the same sense as Larry Shiner understands “poetics of history”, i.e. as a potential, “that literary and rhetoric analysis can illuminate the non-narrative as well as the narrative aspect of historical discourse” (Shiner L. The Secret Mirror. Literary Form and History in Tocqueville’s Recollections – Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988. – p. 2). Taking into account this analogy, I can say that a literary and rhetorical analysis of philosophy can illuminate a non-narrative as well as a narrative aspect of the philosophical discourse.

Purposes and Tasks

The general purpose of this work is twofold: to offer a new perspective for study of Solovyov's texts and to apply the method of narrative analysis, in the first place, in order to shed new light on these texts, and, in the second place, to demonstrate the possibilities of this method. There are two aspects in this application, which are connected with the traditional linguistic division of synchrony and diachrony⁹. Generally speaking, one can either describe the stable forms of narrative and tropes synchronically, or trace back the evolutionary process of this narrative, the "discontinuités" (Michel Foucault's term in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*¹⁰) in its development (diachronically), and possible influence on subsequent tradition. In the latter case, I need to extend my analysis to Solovyov's other works. Aiming to find a balance between the two extremes mentioned above, I will, first, describe the narrative system in Solovyov's early work and highlight how this system developed at several points.¹¹

The preceding tradition of Solovyov studies certainly did not ignore *The Crisis*: section 2.1 discusses the results of more than 125 years of reception of Solovyov's philosophy. But all scholars have regarded it as Solovyov's initial work of philosophy in the religious metaphysical manner, creating a critical historico-philosophical narrative. This is certainly accurate, and I do not question such conclusions. At the same time, during the more than hundred years studies of Solovyov no one has made a serious investigation of the content of Solovyov's work from the perspective of how his ideas were expressed, put together and represented in his works. In other words, there has been exclusive focus on what he said and this trend continues.

The very strong and influential tradition of Vladimir Solovyov's philosophy can be referred to, as a paradigm for subsequent Russian idealistic

⁹ Which is, according to Roman Jakobson and Yuri Tynyanov, "the opposition between the concept of system and the concept of evolution". (Jakobson R. *Problems in the Study of Language and Literature* // Jakobson R. *Selected Writing* in 5 vols., vol. 3, *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry* – The Hague: Mouton Press, 1981. – p. 5)

¹⁰ Foucault M. *L'archéologie du savoir* – Paris: Gallimard, 1969. – p. 17.

¹¹ Jakobson and Tynyanov spoke about a possible compromise between system and its evolution in the above mentioned early article of 1928, but they actually meant the literary system of the whole epoch. They referred to literature as the *belles-lettres*.

philosophy¹² (to use Thomas Kuhn's terminology¹³). Thus, my approach can easily be extended to other authors within this Russian idealist tradition; and Solovyov's influence can be retraced in texts by Nicolai Berdiaev, Sergius Bulgakov, Pavel Florensky, and others.¹⁴ In this work, however, I will limit myself to Solovyov's works.

For the aforementioned general purposes I must fulfill the following concrete tasks.

1. First of all, I need to provide the basis for narrative analysis of philosophical texts. This purpose is realized in chapter 1.

2. I have to identify the main features of Solovyov's narrative, to describe the different levels of his narrative, and to establish the various links between them.¹⁵ I need to estimate the literary qualities of Solovyov's philosophy. For this, I have to trace the development of plots¹⁶ in So-

¹² As Sergius Bulgakov put it in 1924, when the tradition of Russian religious philosophy was already interrupted, – “if Kant is a sacrist of Western philosophy, born from the scholasticism, then Solovyov, *mutatis mutandis*, is the same for Russian philosophy. (Булгаков С.Н. О Соловьеве // Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1999 г. , под ред. М.А.Колерова – М.: ОГИ, 1999. – С. 214 (*Research on History of Russian Thought. Year-book 1999*)).

¹³ Kuhn T. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971. – pp. 10–22.

¹⁴ Taking into account a common feature of this kind of work: the less original the philosopher or writer, the easier it is to find elements of authoritative (paradigmatic) previous systems which influenced him.

¹⁵ I understand the “Levels” as *les niveaux* in the sense of R.Barthes (Barthes R. *Introduction à l'analyse structurale des récits* // *Communications*, 8. *L'analyse structurale du récit* – Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – pp. 11-12.)

¹⁶ There are a number of conceptions differentiating plot and *fabula* (also *sujet* and *fabula*, for example, as in the translation of Yuri Lotman's book, which has become a classic for the Russian school of literary studies, *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (*Michigan Slavic Contribution*; no. 7) – Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1977. – p. 232). The most representative quotation, that clarifies this question can be found in Boris Tomashevsky's *Theory of Literature*: “We use the word *fabula* to describe the sum total of interconnected events communicated in the work In opposition to the *fabula* stands the *sujet*, i.e. the same events, but in the form of their exposition, the order in which they are communicated in the work, the system of connections through which we are informed of the events in the work” (Ibid. p.232). See for more details in Lotman Y. *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (*Michigan Slavic Contribution*; no. 7) – Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977. – pp. 231-239. There are reviews of this question in: Culler J. *Structuralist Poetics. Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature* – Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1975. – pp. 205–224; Serge C. *Introduction to the Analysis of the Literary Text* – Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988. – pp. 89–94.

lovoyov's works, the history of his characters (personages), and the "emplotments"¹⁷ of his philosophy. I complete this task in sections 2.2–2.13.

3. Next is the task of describing the functions of his characters (section 2.3), and discovering how some motifs are connected with these characters at the narrative level (sections 2.9–2.11.) and, if possible, to denote the tropes which are used in Solovyov's works (2.5–2.7., 2.10–2.12). My aim in this case is mainly to describe the structures of the texts themselves, rather than create new or general typologies. I will not try to answer the question, "What is this text about?" but the question, "What is this text?" This takes us back to Shklovsky's and Eikhenbaum's formula "How is this or that text constructed?"¹⁸ Generally speaking, it means that I analyze narrative structures within the text and the tropes (stylistic devices) of which the text consists.

¹⁷ I understand the character as "the major totalizing force in fiction", and an individual that plays a role in the text; this is close to Vladimir Propp's concept of a function in text. For details see the Chapter "Character" in J. Culler's *Structuralist Poetics. Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature* – Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1975. – pp. 230–238. The concept of emplotment has been developed in narrative analysis by White. He writes: "But a given historian is forced to emplot the whole set of stories making up his narrative in one comprehensive or *archetypal* story form". (White H. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* – Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – pp. 7–8) Paul Ricoeur comments on White's conception: "By emplotment he means much more than the simple combination of the linear aspect of the story and the argumentative aspect of the proposed thesis. He means the kind of story, therefore one of the configurative categories we have learned to distinguish in our culture" (Ricoeur P. *Time and Narrative*, in 3 vols., vol. 1 /Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer/ – Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1984. – p. 166)

¹⁸ The titles of their works are Shklovsky V., *How "Don Quixote" is Constructed?* and Eikhenbaum B., *How Gogol's "Overcoat" is Constructed?* Works of the Formalists have been published in different editions: See Шкловский В. Б. О теории прозы – М.: Федерация, 1929. (Victor Chklovski *Comment est fait "Don Quichotte"?* // Chklovski V. *Sur la theorie de la prose.* /Traduit du russe par Guy Verret/ – Lausanne: Editions l'Age d'Homme, 1973. – pp. 107–145) and Эйхенбаум Б. М. Как сделана "Шинель" Гоголя (*Wie Gogol's "Mantel" gemacht ist*) // *Texte der Russischen Formalisten*, Band I – Мюнхен: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1969. – S. 122–159. On Russian Formalism see: Sherwood R. *Viktor Shklovsky and the Development of Early Formalist Theory of Prose Literature // Russian Formalism. A Collection of Articles and Texts in Translation* / Edited by Stephen Bahm and John Bowlit/ – Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1973. – pp. 26–40 and Stacy R. *Defamiliarization in Language in Literature* – Syracuse University Press, 1977. – pp. 1-49.

4. In chapter 3 my aim is to describe the evolution of the original narrative system of Solovyov as well as some of its novelties in comparison with the narrative of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*.

As a whole, my work is an attempt to describe Solovyov's *écriture*.¹⁹

In the light of this general problem of philosophical writing, I think there is a need for a better understanding of some brilliant works in philosophy (Russian philosophy in particular). The influence of these works cannot be attributed solely to novelty of ideas and re-arrangement of known ideas.²⁰ In this study, I shall solve a problem that has not yet been outlined, namely the question of what kind of artistic whole we are actually confronting when we read a book like *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. Any other major work, whether of Solovyov or, of another philosopher, could serve as a case-study for the structure of the book. Books have a fate of their own, and we read them at different times in our life. I was impressed by *The Crisis* some time earlier, and now, as reader and scholar, I am trying to answer the question of what may, or should impress the reader in this book.

¹⁹ I use the original French term here. In the sense of Roland Barthes (*Writing Degree Zero* /Translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith/ – New York: The Noonday Press – pp. 9–18) it can be understood as a process of writing (*écriture*).

²⁰ This is a starting-point of any research. “The method of social sciences, like that of the natural sciences, consists in trying out tentative solutions to certain problems: the problems from which our investigations start, and those which turns up during the investigation”. Popper K. *The Logic of the Social Sciences // The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology* – London: Heinemann, 1976. – p. 89.

CHAPTER 1. TOWARDS A MODEL FOR THE NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHILOSOPHICAL TEXTS

1.1. Narrative Approach and Philosophic Text. A Methodological Introduction and Foundation

In this section I will explain my choice of a combination of approaches. The difference between my approach and Barthes' project of textual analysis¹ is that I do not make active use of the concept of "code", considering it irrelevant for Solovyov's philosophical texts in this study. I believe that the system of codes in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* is rather simple – philosophical and historiosophical. Contrary to Barthes' approach to texts as combinations of codes, I concentrate on the analysis of the *form* of Solovyov's text, rather than its *content*. In practice, this means that I focus on finding the rhetorical and poetical elements in Solovyov's texts.

Generally speaking, I share a hermeneutic vision of the text "as the manifestation in discourse of a specific kind of time-consciousness or structure of time"², although, in my opinion, this is hard to prove and apply in any kind of analysis of the text.³ The references to Bakhtin's

¹ We have a brief description of this process in Barthes R. *Textual Analysis of a Tale of Poe // On Signs*, Edited by Marshall Blonsky – Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985. – pp. 85–97. Several notes of Barthes, collected by Tzvetan Todorov, develop Barthes' point: "The text is plural. This does not only mean that it has several meanings but that it fulfills the very plurality of meanings: *an irreducible* (and not just acceptable plural). The critic's task, according to Barthes, is "not the decipherment of the work's meaning but the reconstruction of the rules and constraints of that meaning's elaboration", "The critic is not responsible for reconstructing the work's messages but only its system". (Todorov T. *Literature and its Theories. A Personal View of 20th Century Criticism* /translated by Catherine Porter / – London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988. – p. 63).

² White H. *The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory // History and Theory*, №. 7 – The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1984. – p. 8.

³ "Hermeneutics is the theory of the operations of understanding in their relation to the interpretation of texts". (Ricoeur P. *The Task of Hermeneutics // Ricoeur P. Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation* /Edited and translated J.Thompson/ – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. – p. 43.) Richard Palmer's definition is: "Hermeneutics is the study of understanding, especially the understanding of texts". Albert Divver concludes: "To the reader innocent of the historical context of these definitions, it might seem that hermeneutical inquiry merely does what any theoretically grounded literary study criticism must do: inquiry into the conditions which govern

dialogue, Ricoeur's "time in narrative", or Gurevich's "space in dialogue" are helpful, but they do not help in the selection of concrete devices of analysis. The analysis of poetic and artistic elements in any text is rather traditional, unless one *a priori* applies a concept of the structure of elements in the text. So, I would like to support this hermeneutic vision with a rhetorical perspective, which takes the text as a system of symbolic and poetic elements and puzzles that need to be deciphered and clearly delineated. In this case, the difference between the argumentative structure⁴ of a philosophical text (its claims to absolute truth, its rational argumentation and the elaboration of philosophical problems), and its narrative structure is not crucial, because the narrative structure of the text covers it as a whole and contains more "symbolic acts": symbols, tropes, and stylistic devices which can be outlined in the process of the narrative investigation.

I further examine the source of the ideas and theories which I apply in my work. Hayden White put it in a rather radical manner: "Narration is a manner of speaking as universal as language itself, and narrative is a mode of verbal representation so seemingly natural to human consciousness that to suggest it is a problem might well appear pedantic".⁵

The development of narratology as a theory of narrative and its modifications has taken place in the field of philology, i.e. a sphere between linguistics and literary studies⁶. It is appropriate here to mention the most

textual interpretation. As such, hermeneutics would only be another name for literary theory, or at least for that part of literary theory pertaining to interpretation". (Divver A. *Tracing Hermeneutics* // Natoli J. /Editor/ *Tracing Literary Theory* — Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987. — p. 54.)

⁴ Burke K. *Language as Symbolic Action. Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* — Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966. — p. 514.

⁵ White H. *The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory* // *History and Theory*, № 7. — The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1984. — p. 1.

⁶ I refer to Hayden White's aforementioned article, in which he "attempted a characterization of the discussion of narrative in historical theory that has taken place in the West over the last two or three decades". (Ibid. p. 7) It is a general introduction to the problem of narrative and narrative historiography. I will only mention the theories important to my study. I must say that White's is given from the standpoint of "professional historical studies" and "a narrative historian," (Ibid. p.2) He presents and analyzes the polemics on the narrative approach by five groups of theorists: "First, that represented by certain Anglo-American analytical philosophers (Walsh, Gardiner, Dray, Gallie, Morton White, Danto, Mink) who have sought to establish the epistemic status of narrativity, considered as a *kind of explanation* especially appropriate to the explanation of historical, as against natural, events and processes. Second, that of certain social-scientifically oriented historians, of whom the members of the French *Annales* group may be considered exemplary. This group (Braudel, Furet, Le Goff, LeRoy Ladurie) regarded narrative historiography as a non-scientific, even ideological representational strate-

important ideas, for my purpose, from a number of narrative conceptions.⁷ Vladimir Propp's theory of functions plays "a pioneering role in the domain of narrative semiotics."⁸ I will use the concept of functions in section 2.5. Claude Bremond's application of this theory to literature is also

gy, the extirpation of which was necessary for the transformation of historical studies into a genuine science. Third, that of certain semiologically oriented literary theorists and philosophers (Barthes, Derrida, Todorov, Julia Kristéva, Benveniste, Genette, Eco) who have studied narrative in all its manifestations and viewed it as simply one discursive "code" among others, which might or might not be appropriate for the representation of "reality", depending only on the *pragmatic* aim in view of the speaker of the discourse. And finally, that of certain hermeneutically oriented philosophers, such as Gadamer and Ricoeur, who have viewed narrative as the *manifestation of discourse* of a specific kind of time-consciousness or structure of time. We might have added a fifth category to this list, namely that of certain historians who can be said to belong to no particular philosophical or methodological persuasion, but speak rather from the standpoint of the *doxa* of the profession, as defenders of a craft notion of historical studies, and who view narrative as a respectable way of doing history". (Ibid. pp.7–8)

⁷ In recent years, narratology characterizes a very broad interdisciplinary approach to different spheres in Humanities, and it is difficult to talk about narratology as a separate field of study. It is rather a group of methods used by artificial intelligence researchers, educationalists, linguists, literary theorists, and psychologists. (See Emmott C. *Narrative Comprehension. A Discourse Perspective* – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. – p. VI.) I am not sure if scholars working in the sphere of the mental processing of texts still think that they work within the same narrative paradigm. I do not think that my analysis has anything in common with artificial intelligence or psychology, apart from the narrative terminology. So I would like to say that I limit myself to a literary understanding of narrative analysis. Thus, I use the narrative methods and conceptions applicable, first of all, to literary studies. They have been described in Russian in: Современное зарубежное литературоведение (страны западной Европы и США): концепции, школы, термины. Энциклопедический справочник, под ред. И.П.Ильина – М.: Интрада, 1996. – С. 63–79 (*Modern Western Literary Study: Conceptions, Schools, Terms. Encyclopedic Reference Work*). In English, they have been described in Martin's *Recent Theories of Narrative* – Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986. – pp. 21–30 and in *The John Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism* /Edited by M.Groden and M.Kreiswirth/ – Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1994. – p. 775. I will give the titles of Russian works first in the original, then an English translation of the title in the English edition – or my own, if the book is not translated into English. In the Bibliography at the end of the dissertation, all Russian titles will be given in the original first, then in the Library of Congress-transliteration, and then in the existing English or my own translation, if a book is not translated into English (unless otherwise indicated).

⁸ Ricoeur P. *The Narrative Function // Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation* /Edited and translated by J.Thompson/ – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. – p. 282. See Пропп В.Н. Морфология сказки – М.: Наука, 1969. – С. 167 (Propp V. *Morphology of Fairy-tale*). The first Russian edition of 1928.

very important for my idea as a whole.⁹ And I will use the classification of narrative functions established by Roland Barthes and his theory of levels of narrative, realized by Barthes himself only on fictional texts.¹⁰ Furthermore, it is very important for me to use some ideas of the theory of literature worked out by Tzvetan Todorov and, most of all, his thesis that “literature is a systematically organized language”.¹¹ This point of view gives me the opportunity to examine Solovyov’s text as literature which, according to Vladimir Nabokov, is in its turn a phenomenon of language, but not of ideas”.¹²

Further, I use the terms and concept of literary studies as worked out by Boris Tomashevsky.¹³ I also use the scheme of communication in a text, and the scheme of the language of a message as presented by Roman Jakobson.¹⁴ The technique of deciphering a “story” in a text that does not belong to the traditional sphere of *belles-lettres* is taken mostly from the

⁹ Claude Bremond applied this concept to the literary texts in his work *Logique des possibles narratifs // Communications, 8. L'analyse structurale du récit* – Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – pp. 66–82). The first French edition of 1967. The Russian edition: Бремонт К. Логика повествовательных возможностей // Семиотика и искусствоведение – М.: Наука, 1972. – С.108–135. He wrote: “A la différence de Propp, aucune de ces fonctions ne nécessite celle qui la suit dans la séquence. Au contraire, lorsque la fonction qui ouvre la séquence est posée, le narrateur conserve toujours la liberté de la faire passer à l’acte ou de la maintenir à l’état de virtualité: si une conduite est présentée comme devant être tenue, si un événement est à prévoir, l’actualisation de la conduite ou de l’événement peut aussi bien avoir lieu que ne pas se produire. Si le narrateur choisit d’actualiser cette conduite ou cet événement, il conserve la liberté de laisser le processus aller jusqu’à son terme ou de l’arrêter en cours de route: le conduite peut atteindre ou manquer son but, l’événement suivre ou non son cours jusqu’au terme prévu”. (pp. 66–67)

¹⁰ Barthes R. *Introduction à l’analyse structurale des récits // Communications, 8 L’analyse structurale du récit* – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1981 – pp. 12–21. (Russian edition: Барт Р. Введение в структурный анализ повествовательных текстов // Зарубежная эстетика и теория литературы XIX–XX веков: трактаты, статьи, эссе – М.: МГУ, 1987. – С. 387–422)

¹¹ Todorov T. *The Notion of Literature // Genres in Discourse*, /Translated from French by Catherine Porter/ – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. – pp. 1–12. (Russian edition: Тодоров Ц. Понятие литературы // Семиотика – М.: Радуга, 1983. – С. 361. (Todorov T. *The Concept of Literature*)

¹² Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1997 /Отв. ред. М.А.Колеров/ – СПб.: Алетейя, 1997. – С. 135. (*Research on History of Russian Thought. Year-book 1997*)

¹³ Томашевский Б.В. Теория литературы. Поэтика – М.: Аспект Пресс, 1996. – С.334 (Tomashevsky B. *Theory of Literature. Poetics*). The first Russian edition was printed in 1925.

¹⁴ Jakobson R. *Linguistics and Poetics // Jakobson R. Selected Writing in 5 vols., vol. 3, Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry* – The Hague: Mouton Press, 1981. – p. 22 (Russian edition: Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика // Структурализм: “за” и “против” – М.: Прогресс, 1975. – С. 198).

works of Frederick Jameson (who is “generally considered to be one of the foremost contemporary Marxist literary critics writing in English”¹⁵). In *The Vanishing Mediator*, he shows that “Weber is writing against another position; his text is designated to correct some widespread misapprehension of the nature of Protestantism, and of its relationship to business ethics”.¹⁶ He gives an analysis of the way in which Max Weber’s ideas are expressed, and in Jameson’s opinion, “the narrative analysis requires us to explain the imaginative illusion of change, of time, or of history itself, by reference to basic components of the narrative line that are bound to be static ones”.¹⁷ Following Jameson’s example, I will try to define the basic components of Solovyov’s narrative.

In 1987, Anthony Cascardi edited a collection of essays about the relationship between philosophy and literature, *Literature and the Question of Philosophy*, in which we find several discussions of Plato’s dialogues, Descartes’ *Meditations*, and other philosophical works, as literary texts.¹⁸ Jorge Gracia mentions this book when he talks about a literary critic’s approach to the history of philosophy. The book gives very valuable reflections on the “understanding of philosophical texts as literature”, although, for its authors, Plato’s dialogues remain the best field of literary study in philosophy. From this book, I have taken several ideas, and a general vision on the relationship between philosophy and literature, especially from Arthur Danto’s *Philosophy as/and/of Literature*.¹⁹ Danto describes the history of the mutual relationship of literature and philosophy and “the boundaries between philosophy and literature”.²⁰ There are several examples of textual analysis of traditional philosophical texts in this collection of essays.²¹ Although, this kind of discourse analysis has little in common with

¹⁵ Jameson Frederick // *The John Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism* /Edited by M.Groden and M.Kreiswirth/ – Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1989. – p. 424.

¹⁶ Jameson Fr. *The Vanishing Mediator; or, Max Weber as Storyteller* // Jameson Fr. *The Ideologies of Theory. Essays 1971–1986*. In 2 vols., vol. 2, *Syntax of History* – London: Routledge, 1988. – p. 20.

¹⁷ Ibid. p.18.

¹⁸ *Literature and the Question of Philosophy* /Edited by A.Cascardi/ – Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1987. – p. 333.

¹⁹ Arthur Danto *Philosophy as/and/of Literature* // Cascardi A. /Editor/ *Literature and the Question of Philosophy* – Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1987. – pp. 3–23.

²⁰ Ibid. p. 1.

²¹ Ibid. (Berger H., *Levels of Discourse in Plato’s Dialogues*, p. 75–100; Judovitz D., *Philosophy and Poetry: The Difference between Them in Plato and Descartes*, p.24–51; McCormick P., *Philosophical Discourses and Fictional Texts*, p.52–74).

what I do in my work. I would like to mention Peter McCormick's analysis of the excerpts from three purely philosophical texts: Hume's *Of the Standard of Taste* (1757), Kant's *Critique of Judgement* (1790), and Hegel's Berlin lectures on art (the 1820's) at the level of discourse.²² First of all, he discusses "the texts themselves as fictional (i.e. do they contain the illocutions as representations or as performances"²³, in John Austin and John Searle's terms²⁴). In the present study, I do not accent the problem of fictionality of philosophical texts, but simply accept them as literature. Secondly, my aim in the analysis of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* and some aspects of Solovyov's other works goes beyond analysis of texts at the level of discourse. Unlike McCormick, I will give a deeper, multi-level analysis of a number of Solovyov's texts.

So I acknowledge a debt to the concepts developed and applied by Danto and his colleagues in *Literature and the Question of Philosophy*. I appreciate and share their ideology, as well as their attitude to philosophical texts as literature, if not their method of analyzing the texts.

I will also apply the concept of historical narrative developed by Hayden White wherever possible bearing in mind the difference between historiography and philosophy, which I will discuss in detail later; I have tried to apply his method of researching "the emplotments"²⁵ and "types of argumentation"²⁶ for Solovyov's *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. Lionel Gossman's *The Empire Unpossess'd. An Essay on Gibbon's "Decline and Fall"*, and Larry Shiner's *The Secret Mirror* prove to be good examples of the application of the narrative method to a non-literary text.²⁷ Gossman

²² McCormick P., *Philosophical Discourses and Fictional Texts*, Ibid. p. 60–68.

²³ Ibid. p. 60.

²⁴ Straus B. R. *Influencing Theory: Speech Act* // Natoli J. /Editor/ *Tracing Literary Theory* – Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987. – pp. 213–247.

²⁵ "By emplotment I meant simply the encodation of the facts contained in the chronicle as components of specific kind of plot-structures, in precisely the way that Northrop Frye has suggested is the case with "fictional" in general". (White H. *The Historical Text as Literary Artifact* // *The Writing of History. Literary Form and Historical Understanding* – Madison, London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978. – p. 46.).

²⁶ White H. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* – London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – pp. 1–7.

²⁷ Gossman L. *The Empire Unpossess'd. An Essay on Gibbon's "Decline and Fall"* – Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981 – p. 160; Shiner L. *The Secret Mirror. Literary Form and History in Tocqueville's Recollections* – Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988. – p. 224.

analyzes “the text of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* itself, the intellectual and ideological context in which it was produced, and the literary conventions by which it was shaped”.²⁸ Shiner describes the portraits, aphorisms, anecdotes, chronicles, different codes, and voices in Alexis Tocqueville’s *Recollections*.

Finally, aside from the works mentioned above, there is a long and fruitful tradition of analysis of literary texts or belles-lettres; a review of this tradition would have required far more space than is appropriate for the present study. There are the currents of rhetorical, stylistic and structural analysis (though closely interrelated) of the artistic text; in the Russian tradition the works of Yury Lotman and Boris Uspensky are considered classical (not to mention Roman Jakobson, Boris Eikhenbaum, Viktor Shklovsky, Yury Tynyanov, and Mikhail Bakhtin, all of whose works were and will be mentioned in connection with concrete ideas which go back to them). However, in their work I have not found any application of literary methods to a philosophical text, although these may be implicit.²⁹ One of the Formalists, Nikolai Trubetskoi, investigated a non-literary text, and I will discuss his analysis.

At times I will be using devices of textual analysis taken from Russian authors without clear source reference, because it is impossible to trace back the origin of certain devices and elements of close reading. In such cases I will rely on the personal (or tacit) knowledge³⁰ based on my study at the faculty of philology. In this way I continue an existing tradition of textual analysis, while focusing on philosophical texts not usually considered as an ideal object for such analysis.

On the whole, then, I shall discuss philosophical texts using methods worked out by Barthes, Danto, Derrida, and others, but applied to

²⁸ Gossman L. *The Empire Unpossess’d. An Essay on Gibbon’s “Decline and Fall”*—Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.—p. IX.

²⁹ Umberto Eco writes about such a possibility: “It is even possible to assign a *fabula* to a metaphysical treatise such as Spinoza’s *Ethica more geometrico demonstrata*. As a matter of fact, in this story there is no change: the *Ethica* tells of a universe in which nothing “new” happens (since the order and the connection of things is the same as the order and the connection of ideas)”. (Eco U. *The Role of the Reader. Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*—Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press, 1979.—p. 30.) In comparison with Spinoza’s *Ethica*, Solovyov’s *The Crisis* has a developed story about European philosophy, and it gives one more reason to look at it as a story with a *fabula*.

³⁰ I am using Michael Polanyi’s term. See Polanyi M. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-critical Philosophy*—London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.—pp. 249–321.

Solovyov studies. However, because of my training and background in Russia, I investigate Solovyov's works with active use of Russian (Formalist, structuralist, and post-structuralist) methods of narrative analysis.

What is called narrative analysis can be interpreted in a broad and in a narrow sense. In a broad sense it is very close to literary studies and to the analysis of a narrative as an artistic text. The tradition of commenting and analyzing different texts started in Ancient Greece, (or India and China), and the first texts analyzed and commented as classics were not only Homer's poems or Ancient tragedies and comedies, but also Plato's dialogues, since they were traditionally considered to be at least half-literary, and not purely philosophical texts³¹. Since Ancient times, there has been a kind of division of labor in textual analysis, and most analytical work for texts has been done within the context of literary studies and rhetoric. In my opinion, the first attempt at literary analysis of a half-literary text within Russian Formalism (namely, a medieval traveler's diary) is Nikolai Trubetskoi's *Afanasij Nikitin's "Journey Beyond the Three Seas" as a Work of Literature*,³² although the author was actually trying "to apply the formalist approach to the case of an old Russian work of literature belonging to the end of the fifteenth century"³³ and to show that it is a literary work suitable for literary analysis.

Indirectly, it was a starting point for the extension of Formalist analysis to areas outside traditional *belles-lettres*. The attempt of Trubetskoi was not followed up within the Formalist School, but later on the narrative approach to the texts of historians was developed in the domain of studies of history³⁴ – although in comparison with the development of literary and cultural studies of the 1960s-70s it was not a dominant trend. Since Russian Formalism dissolved in the 1920s, Roman Jakobson and later (in the 1960s-

³¹ On the rhetorical element in Plato see: Kirby J. *A Classicist's Approach to Rhetoric in Plato // Philosophy and Rhetoric*, vol. 30, № 2 – The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997. – pp. 190–202.

³² Trubetskoi N. *Afanasij Nikitin's "Journey Beyond the Three Seas" as a Work of Literature // Reading in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views* – Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: MIT Press, 1971. – pp. 199–219. The first publication in Russian in 1926 (Трубецкой Н.С. "Хождения за три моря" как литературный памятник, Версты, № 1, 1926, С. 164–186).

³³ Ibid. p. 200.

³⁴ It is interesting to notice that even in 1990 Lionel Gossman asserted that "traditionally, history and fictional storytelling confront and challenge each other as opposite poles of narrative practice". (Gossman L. *Between History and Literature* – Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990. – p. 247).

70s) Algirdas Greimas³⁵, Roland Barthes, Tzvetan Todorov, Jacques Derrida³⁶, Hillis Miller³⁷, Yuri Lotman, and other representatives of semiotics, structuralism, and post-structuralism developed the semiotic approach to literature. They worked in literary studies, although they extended their methods to different arts, just as the Formalists did,³⁸ and did not analyze non-literary texts specifically.

Largely due to their influence, some historians started practicing the narrative and structural approach with respect to traditional texts of history and philosophy of history: Frederik Jameson, Hayden White, Lionel Gossman, Larry Shiner, Franklin Ankersmit. White's *Metahistory*, summarizing the narrative approach to history and philosophy of history, appeared in 1973,³⁹ and since that time the literary study of a non-literary text has become more or less legitimate; apart from the aforementioned book of Jameson *The Vanishing Mediator*, I will refer to several works in the footnotes as examples of narrative analysis of non-literary texts.⁴⁰

³⁵ Greimas A. *Structural Semantics. An Attempt at a Method* – Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1983. – p. 325. He is the author of a comprehensive edition of Greimas A. and Courtes J. *Semiotics and Language. An Analytical Dictionary* – Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982. – p. 409. The last edition is very valuable due to the Selected Bibliography (pp. 384–409) where the most important works on the problem of narrative analysis are mentioned.

³⁶ Derrida J. *Writing and Difference* – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. – p. 342.

³⁷ Miller H. *The Linguistic Moment. From Wordsworth to Stevens* – New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985. – p. 445.

³⁸ See: Eikhenbaum B. *Literature and Cinema*; Shklovsky V. *Poetry and Prose in Cinematography // Russian Formalism. A Collection of Articles and Texts in Translation* /Edited by Stephen Bann and John Bowlt/ – Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1973. – pp. 122–131.

³⁹ White H. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* – London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – p. 448.

⁴⁰ There is a work about Pascal's ordinary language: Marin L. *On the Interpretation of Ordinary Language: a Parable of Pascal in Textual Strategies. Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* /Edited and with an introduction by J. Harari/ – Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1979. – pp. 239–259. Louis Marin analyzes Pascal's parabolic narrative, different codes in it, and the function of representation. He defends the postulate that *meaning is plural* and elaborates "a logic of diversity and divergence in which meaning is not assignable to a closed system of univocal signs, but in which it has produced its processes of production by the displacement of signifiers". (Ibid. p. 239) This work reveals how the meanings in Pascal's fragments are produced, but does not describes the rhetorical devices, because it is obvious from the title that Pascal's language in *Pensées* is ordinary.

I do not investigate Solovyov's works from an ideological framework, because it is not a scientific approach and it is already an established manner of writing books and articles⁴¹, at least in Russia, where people often try to write about Solovyov using his own language and metaphors.⁴² My feeling is that this approach has exhausted most of its resources.

The last example of an interesting application of "an objective method" to Solovyov's work or, better, a dissertation on Russian philosophy in which the author does not mention methodological foundations, or just giving the traditional phrases about "objectivity", "dialectics", "historicism", etc. is Boris Mezhuyev's 1992 dissertation. Here the author provides

⁴¹ This is not a general practice, but in a number of works the influence of this paradigm is obvious. These works are addressed to students and general public, and the genre of these works dictates the rules and style. I would like to mention works of Leonid Shaposhnikov (*Philosophical Portraits*), Arseny Gulyga (*The Russian Idea and its Creators*), Alexandr Yermichev (*On Philosophy in Russia*), Sergei Kornilov (*Philosophy of Self-knowledge and Creation. Portraits of Russian Thinkers*), Kirill Faradzhev (*Vladimir Solovyov: Mythology of the Image*). For Russian titles, see the Bibliography, at the end of this work.

⁴² The most interesting example of this style is a work which I have found in the library of the Center for Russian Humanities Studies, the Advanced Doctoral dissertation of Sergei Puhskin *Historiosophy of Russian Conservatism of the 19th Century* (Пушкин С.Н. Историософия русского консерватизма 19-го века: Диссертация на соискание степени доктора философских наук – Нижний Новгород, 1997. – С. 319). In Russia, some outstanding researchers write such a second Doctoral dissertation for the title "Doctor of Science". In this work it is practically impossible, in some passages, to distinguish between a thought of a Slavophilic author of the 19th century and S.Pushkin's point of view. For example, the source of the idea that "the spirit of Sobornost can be understood and accepted by an Orthodox only" (p. 34) is not clear, whether coming from Alexei Khomyakov, the great Russian philosopher of the 19th century, or modern Russian scholars Lev Shaposhnikov or Sergei Pushkin. It is also not very clear who proposed the thesis that "Such a high principle can only be a religious principle only, that brings to the world the truth of providentialism, that neither man nor people are able to realize in their earthly life" (p.38), Yuri Samarin in the 19th century or S.Pushkin in 1997. "Only in Christianity can mankind finally avoid the necessity and chance to implement the search of freedom in all wholeness, because the spirit of freedom triumphs only in Christianity" (p. 47) – the author proclaims in his dissertation, either from Khomiakov's point of view, or from his own. There are no quotation marks, and the distance of 150 years between two writers disappears miraculously. On the one hand, there is a link between Russian conservatives of the 19th century and the modern professor, and it is an interesting one. On the other hand, the uncritical and rather apologetic approach of the dissertation exemplifies the presence of "timeless truth" in the text, but in this case it is no longer Marxist-Leninism but Slavophile doctrine. If one were to present this text in the international media, some positions of the dissertation are quite ambiguous.

an extremely broad social and intellectual context of Russian academic and literary life of the 1870s-1890s, but the dissertation is mostly about the links between Solovyov and his predecessors⁴³

Taking into consideration that Solovyov was talented in many genres of literature,⁴⁴ and that in his first philosophical works he wrote as an academic philosopher⁴⁵, it is relevant to try to uncover his literary talent in his academic works. We should mention at some point that we are making an evaluation of all his works, no matter which ideas are represented there, or how they correspond to a current political situation, or

⁴³ Межуев Б.В. Отечественные истоки философии В. С. Соловьева (Социокультурный контекст 70–90-х гг. XIX века): Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М., 1992. – С. 208. (Mezhuyev B. *Russian Sources of V. Solovyov's Philosophy (Socio-cultural Context of the 70s-90s of the 19th Century)*; PhD dissertation). It is officially considered a dissertation in philosophy, as it is seen from its Russian title. I would say that it marks the transition to a more historical and cultural study approach to Solovyov's (and of course, in a broader sense, Russian) philosophy within the Russian academic tradition.

⁴⁴ There is a long tradition of study of Solovyov as a poet and writer, started by Vladimir Savodnik's *Vladimir Solovyov's Poetry* (Саводник В. Ф. Поэзия Владимира Соловьева // Русский вестник, № 11, СПб., 1900), Yuri Eikh-enwald *Vladimir Solovyov* (The last Russian edition: Айхенвальд Ю.И. Владимир Соловьев (его стихотворения) // Силуэты русских писателей – М.: Республика, 1994. – С. 370–372). In the Soviet Union, this tradition has been interrupted for many years for ideological reasons, but was renewed by Zinaida Mints at the beginning of the 1970s (See her article *Vladimir Solovyov – Poet* in the edition of Solovyov's poetry: Минц З.Г. Владимир Соловьев – поэт // Соловьев В.С. Стихотворения и шуточные пьесы – Ленинград: Советский писатель, 1974. – С. 5–56). There are several dissertations on Solovyov's poetry: Knigge A. *Die Lyrik Vl. Solov'evs und ihre Nachwirkung bei A. Belyj und A. Blok*, PhD dissertation, University of Kiel, 1972; and Pollach R. *Vers- und Reimtechnik in den Gedichten V.S. Solov'evs* – Tübingen: University of Tübingen, PhD dissertation, 1983. I started as a researcher of Solovyov's poetry myself (Смердов И.В. Автор и лирический персонаж в поэзии Владимира Соловьева // Аспирант. Сборник научных трудов аспирантов НГЛУ – Нижний Новгород: НГЛУ, 1996. – С. 31–36 (Smerdov I. *The Author and Lyrical Personage in Vladimir Solovyov's Poetry*)) and originally planned this study as a dissertation on Solovyov's poetry. But probably because of the strong opinion of some scholars that "Solovyov's poetic talent is not great," Solovyov's philosophy became the focus of this textual study. There is also a PhD dissertation on Solovyov's literary criticism: Перепелкина Л.Д. Эстетика и литературная критика В.С. Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филол. наук – СПб.: Издательство Спб-ского университета, 1993. – С.157 (Perepelkina L. *Aesthetics and Literary Criticism by Vladimir Solovyov*; PhD Dissertation).

⁴⁵ According to Andrzej Walicki, *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* is a more purely speculative work than any of Kireevsky's articles" (Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989. – p. 563.)

the opinion of people in power⁴⁶ (although this was important in Russia until recent times, even in relatively liberal periods).⁴⁷ After that, we can look at several of his works as texts with their own principles and structures, as outstanding examples of philosophical discourse. We thus automatically get rid of ideologically committed procedures⁴⁸ and arrive at a space, “outside this polemic context where the dichotomy “Slavophilism – Westernism” makes sense”, as Vladimir Malakhov stated.⁴⁹ So I am

⁴⁶ “The fate of Solovyov in Soviet times reflects the vicissitudes of Soviet philosophical culture. After 1923, only literary texts of Solovyov were published in Soviet Russia, until 1988. In the main philosophical journal, *Voprosy filosofii*, Solovyov was discussed for the first time in 1959, and studies were rare and predictable, reflecting an official position. They generally qualified Solovyov as a religious mystical idealist with reactionary political views, eclipsed his liberal views, and criticized “contemporary reactionary historians of philosophy” who turned him into one of the greatest Russian philosophers. Most characteristically, his basic category of *vseedinstvo* (all-unity) was interpreted, from the standpoint of the given philosophical truth of dialectical materialism, as appropriate guess, albeit misinterpreted idealistically; this does not do justice to Solovyov as someone who dealt with philosophical problems as he perceived them”. (Zweerde E. van der *The Normalization of the History of Philosophy in Post-Soviet Russian Philosophical Culture // The Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*, vol. XII – Boston: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2001. – pp. 98–99) There is a detailed account of the Soviet attitude to Solovyov in the chapter *The Soviet Judgement and Criticism of Solovyov* in Dahm H. *Vladimir Solovyev and Max Scheler: Attempt at a Comparative Interpretation. A Contribution to the History of Phenomenology* /Translated from the German by Kathleen Wright/ – Dordrecht-Holland/Boston-USA: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1975. – pp. 216–234.

⁴⁷ *Философия Шеллинга в России* /под редакцией В. Пустарнакова/ – СПб.: Издательство Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 1998. – С.16 (*Schelling's Philosophy in Russia* /Edited by V.Pustarnakov/). It is an example of the importance of a tsar and his ministers' attitude towards Schelling's philosophy, and there is a conclusion that, “if the government of Alexandr the 1st was guided by opinions of people like Magnitsky only, the fate of Schelling's philosophy in Russia would be another. Because there were people like Speransky in power, the attitude towards Schelling could cause some condescension sanctioned from the top”. The situation with respect to Solovyov's philosophy in the 20th century was similar: the attitude towards it depended on the political state of affairs; as a result, for the most part of the century his philosophy in the Soviet Union was severely criticized from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint.

⁴⁸ Sergei Khoruzhy described them as “non-finished and disputable” and “staying within the limits of traditional binary oppositions: Russia – West, the Original – the Borrowed, etc”. (Хоружий С.С. О старом и новом – СПб.: Алетея, 2000. – С.9. (Khoruzhy S. *On the Old and the New*)).

⁴⁹ Малахов В.С. Русская духовность и немецкая ученость. О немецких исследованиях истории русской мысли // Россия и Германия: Опыт философского диалога. – М.: Медиум, 1993. – С. 98. (Malakhov V. *Russian Spirituality and German Bildung. On German Researches of Russian Thought*).

realizing the option of analyzing the content of a chosen text from a formal (formalist, ideologically neutral) point of view. The most important units of my analysis of the text will be its subject, composition, metaphors, tropes, and other components of the narrative.

In general, my approach is closely connected with Barthes' project of "textual analysis",⁵⁰ but does not coincide with it, because Barthes analyzes texts in a very free manner more suited to books for general readers than for academic dissertations where statements must be grounded and proven.⁵¹ Barthes' project is, in turn, "a re-casting of the theories of text, language and structure".⁵² These theories are associated with the names of Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Julia Kristeva.⁵³ But I am mostly inspired by Hayden White's *Metahistory*, where he offers a thesis of "history as writing".⁵⁴ I acknowledge a significant difference between traditional history (connected with the historical novel from the beginning) and traditional or classical philosophy, which always was considered as a specific type of activity, specific world-view, etc. This list of predecessors provides me with a necessary set of methods, devices, and strategies to investigate Solovyov's works. Therefore, I need to clarify my reliance on some post-structural strategies.

First of all, I share Barthes' thesis that every narrative can be analyzed. As he writes: "Narrative denies the difference between high and mediocre literature; it is present in the world as life itself, overcoming national, historical, and cultural barriers".⁵⁵ In Barthes' opinion, "any narrative text

⁵⁰ I would like to distance myself from the project of deconstruction. According to Hillis Miller, "deconstruction is nothing more or less than good reading as such" (Miller H. *The Ethics of Reading* – New York: Columbia University Press, 1987. – p. 10).

⁵¹ It is possible to say that Roland Barthes extended the method of textual analysis on himself and his own texts as it happened in *Barthes to the Third Power* and the book *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes* (Barthes R. *Barthes to the Third Power // On Signs*, Edited by Marshall Blonsky – Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985. – pp. 189–191).

⁵² Ильин И.П. Постструктурализм. Деконструктивизм. Постмодернизм – М.: Интрада, 1996. – С. 162. (Ilyin I. *Poststructuralism. Deconstructivism. Postmodernism*).

⁵³ See Kristeva J. *The Speaking Subject // On Signs* / Edited by Marshall Blonsky/ – Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985. – pp. 210–220.

⁵⁴ Зверева Г.И. Онтология новой интеллектуальной истории // Вестник РГГУ, № 3. – М.: РГГУ, 1996. – С.196. (Zvereva G. *Ontology of the Recent Intellectual History*).

⁵⁵ "Le recit se moque de la bonne et de la mauvaise littérature: international, transhistorique, transculturel, le recit est la, comme la vie". Barthes R. *Introduction à l'ana-*

is a hierarchy of levels”.⁵⁶ He distinguishes “the level of functions (in the same sense it has in the works of Propp and Bremont); the “level of actions” (in the sense of Greimas⁵⁷, when he talks about characters as “actants”) and the “level of narration”⁵⁸” (which coincides, as a whole, with the notion of the level of narrative discourse in Todorov’s works”).⁵⁹

In my approach, the authors whom Solovyov writes about or mentions are represented on the level of functions. At the level of actions the portrait or picture of a character (personage) of the philosophic narrative (it might also be a trend in European philosophy described by Solovyov) appears. I also use another important class of units in my analysis, viz. “catalysts” (consecutive functions, as Barthes call them, i.e. coming one after another) and “nuclear functions” (consecutive and consequent functions, i.e. following each other as a result or an effect).⁶⁰

Finally, at the level of narration we have the central ideas of the texts I am analyzing (even though these same ideas have often been the subjects of investigations and have already been described in many books⁶¹). In a text

lyse structurale des récits // Communications, 8. L'analyse structurale du récit – Editions du Seuil, 1981. – p. 7. (The Russian edition: Барт Р. Введение в структурный анализ повествовательных текстов // Зарубежная эстетика и теория литературы XIX-XX веков: трактаты, статьи, эссе – М.: МГУ, 1987. – С. 387. (R. Barthes *Introduction into the Structural Analysis of Narrative Texts*)).

⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 11.

⁵⁷ Greimas A.J. *Éléments pour une théorie de l'interprétation du récit mythique // Communications, 8. L'analyse structurale du récit* – Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – pp. 51–53.

⁵⁸ “Narrating is a mediated linguistic realization, whose scope it is to communicate a series of events to one or more interlocutors and to do so in such a way that the interlocutors will participate in this knowledge, and so widen their own pragmatic context. Narration is oriented towards art, when the communication will concern facts that are invented (as deliberate falsehood or for mere pleasure) or, even better, when no immediate finality is involved, and when the narration (true, held to be true, or invented) is cut off from its pragmatic context and structured in an autonomous form”. (Cesare Serge, *Introduction to the Analysis of the Literary Text* – Indiana University Press, 1988. – p. 224).

⁵⁹ R.Barthes *Introduction à l'analyse structurale des récits // Communications, 8. L'analyse structurale du récit* – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – p. 12.

⁶⁰ Barthes wrote: “Obviously, nuclear functions and catalysts, indications and informants are the most important classes of all the units that can be distributed beforehand”. (Ibid. pp. 15–16).

⁶¹ See books: Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т. – Л.: Эго, 1991 (Zenkovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.) The first Russian edition was published in 1948–1950; Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 720 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his*

of Solovyov, like *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, these ideas manifest his opinion and his interpretation of the development of European Philosophy and its Crisis. At the same level, we discover how the subjects of the texts have been developed. Also we find some particular features of description of the philosophical process in Europe (manner of representation of this process: main discussions, disputes, problems, polemics).

Barthes' method can be extended to any narrative, without defining its genre beforehand.⁶² He worked with multi-connnotative texts from *belles-lettres*, and introduced the notions of "code" and "term", but defined them in a very fuzzy and approximate manner.⁶³ Because of their obscurity (or

Time); Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М.: Республика, 1995. – С.607. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*) The first Russian edition was published in 1951; Никольский А.А. Русский Ориген XIX века Вл.С.Соловьев // Вера и Знание, № 10–19, 23–24 – Харьков, 1902. (Nikolsky A. *Russian Origen of the 19th Century Vladimir Solovyov*). This work was republished in 2000 and further I will refer to the latest edition: Никольский А.А. Русский Ориген XIX века Вл.С.Соловьев – СПб.: Наука, 2000. – С. 420; Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция – М.: Республика, 1997. – С.431 (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*) The book was written in 1922–1923 and published in 1977; Трубецкой Е.Н. Миросозерцание Владимира Соловьева, в 2-х т. – М.: Медуим, 1995. (Trubetskoi E. *Vladimir Solovyov's World-view*, in 2 vols.) The first edition was published in 1913. The last example of this style is a book written entirely by Russian scholars but published in the USA, Kuvakin V. /Editor/ *A History of Russian Philosophy. From the Tenth Through the Twentieth Centuries*, in 2 vols. – Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1994. – vol. 2., pp. 436–455.

⁶² Ilya Ilyin writes in his book about poststructuralism in a very vague manner which does not allow for applying his method directly; but only gives guidelines for reflection and analysis. Generally speaking, I will use the pathos of this strategy and its way of reflection only. Concrete and technical details cannot be borrowed from this kind of general reflection of Barthes or Ilyin, and I need to correct my method in accordance with the norms of Solovyov's concrete text: "Roland Barthes points to two principles of textual analysis: a) the principle of distortion and b) the principle of irreversibility. The distortion corresponds to so-called floating microstructure, creating not a logical subject, but an expectation. The second principle, the principle of irreversibility, contradicts it. In a classical story, there are two codes that support the vectorial direction of structuration". (Ильин И.П. Постструктурализм. Деконструктивизм. Постмодернизм – М.: Интрада, 1996. – С. 168. (Ilyin I. *Poststructuralism. Deconstructivism. Postmodernism*)).

⁶³ The example of this manner of Barthes's reflections on the system of codes can be found in *S/Z* – Paris, Édition du Seuil, 1970. – pp. 26–27. In the later work: Barthes R. *Analyse textuelle d'un conte d'Edgar Poe // Sémiotique narrative et textuelle*. – Paris, 1973. pp. 29 – 54 (The English edition: Barthes R. *Textual Analysis of a Tale of Poe // On Signs* /Edited by Marshall Blonsky/ – Baltimor,

suitability for Barthes only) I will not use these notions often, but I mention them because, theoretically, they can be applied to philosophical texts as well.⁶⁴ Barthes proposes that this kind of analysis “will be progressive: we shall proceed step by step along the path of the text, at least postulatively”.⁶⁵ I do not think that a progressive method is suitable for relatively large texts like *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* or *The Justification of the Good*, since the analysis would occupy more space than Solovyov’s original text. So I will not follow the progressive method, making use of Barthes’ postulate that he only gave “a certain number of elementary rules of manipulation, rather than methodological principles”, but I feel free to apply these rules, as they are suitable for the analysis of Solovyov’s texts.

If we compare the philosophical texts of Solovyov to a literary narrative, we have to take into account some specific problems of making a

Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985. — pp. 85–97), in the chapter *Methodological Conclusions* (pp. 93–97) he revised the system of codes, and as a result, it became a system of:

1. Cultural code with all its subdivisions (scientific, rhetorical, chronological, socio-historical).
2. Code of communication or code of address.
3. Symbolic code.
4. Code of actions.
5. Code of Enigma.

“The word code itself should not be taken here in the rigorous, scientific sense of the term. The codes are merely associate fields, a supra-textual organization of notations imposing a certain idea of structure; the authority of the code is, for us, essentially cultural: the codes are certain types of *dūja-vu*, *déjà-lu* and *déjà-fait*: the code is a form of *déjà*, constitutive of all the writing in the world”. (Barthes R. *Textual Analysis of a Tale of Poe // On Signs*, Edited by Marshall Blonsky — The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1985. — p. 93). Because in my approach to Barthes’ conclusion I went through texts of Ilya Ilyin first, I mention his work here as well: “At the same time, the form, where the sense of any narration exists, is a mixture of different voices; it is characterized by the “interruption of action”, the permanent interruption by other senses that creates the reader’s impatience”. (Ильин И.П. Постструктурализм. Деконструктивизм. Постмодернизм — М.: Интрада, 1996. — С. 165–166. (Ilyin I. *Poststructuralism. Deconstructivism. Postmodernism*))

⁶⁴ Perhaps the best explanation is given by J.Culler (although he has also written that “the absence of any code relating to narration is a major flaw in Barthes’ analysis”): “And indeed the five codes isolated in S/Z do not seem exhaustive or sufficient”. See details in Culler J. *Structuralist Poetics. Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature* — Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1975. — pp. 202–203.

⁶⁵ Barthes R. *Textual Analysis of a Tale of Poe // On Signs*, Edited by Marshall Blonsky — The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1985. — p. 85.

distinction between philosophy and literature; within the Russian tradition this distinction does pose problems.⁶⁶ First of all, such a formal approach is unusual for Russian classical philosophy, since it is characterized by ideologies (Orthodoxy, in particular), spiritual visions, religious ideas and the like.⁶⁷ Secondly, there are also difficulties with concrete devices of analysis. This neglect of form appears to be typical of Russian classical philosophy. How a given idea is expressed, is not generally thought to be important,⁶⁸ especially if we take into account such facts: the constant pressure from 19th century Russian authorities on philosophy, censorship, the necessity of using Aesopian language in *publicistika*, the weak position

⁶⁶ It may be because philosophy became a kind of professional activity in Russia only in the 19th century. In the case of Solovyov a clear distinction between philosophy and literature is even more complicated because he was an academic philosopher by training (especially when he wrote *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*) but spent most of his life as a freelance writer and *publicist*.

⁶⁷ I am using the concept of ideology as “a set of ideas”. For an elaboration and assessment of the theory of ideologies see Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Philosophy – the Ideology and the Handmaid. A Historical and Critical Analysis of Soviet Philosophy, with a Case-Study into Soviet History of Philosophy* – Nijmegen, 1994. – pp. 49–54. In the case of Russian philosophy, these ideas are mostly Orthodox and emphasize the role of Orthodoxy in the world and human life. Furthermore, in the case of Solovyov, the situation is much more complicated, because, although his background was Orthodox, he never was an official philosopher of the Russian Orthodox Church and his philosophy of All-unity is an exception for Orthodox doctrine. Jonathan Sutton puts it as follows: “Solovyov attached paramount importance to the consistent application of Christian ethics to all spheres of human activities, for he took the precepts of the Gospels to be the most adequate and efficacious means of ensuring the welfare of all, safeguarding the autonomy of individuals and balancing this with needs of the collective, the needs for social cohesion, justly administrated law, and so forth. These are central considerations in Solovyov’s delineation of his religious philosophy. He taught that Christianity presented man with an ideal of unanimity and community that is quite distinct in essence”. (Sutton J. *The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov. Towards a Reassessment*. – London: Macmillan Press, 1988. – p. 41.) For more details about the relations between Solovyov and Orthodox doctrine, see Sutton J. *The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov. Towards a Reassessment*. – London: Macmillan Press, 1988. – pp. 39–86. See also for details about Solovyov’s relations to the Orthodox officialdom in Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 437–476. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

⁶⁸ In many cases it was a miracle that a given idea was expressed and published at all. The recovery of Russian thought after suppression in the 20th century is outlined in the article by Dzhimbinov S. *The Return of Russian Philosophy // Russian Thought After Communism. The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage /* Edited by P.Scanlan/ – Armonk and London: M.E. Sharpe, 1994. – pp. 11–22.

of academic philosophers, and the traditional situation “from pogrom to pogrom”⁶⁹ in teaching philosophy in the 19th century Russian universities.⁷⁰

Vladimir Solovyov’s life is an example of how easily a talented thinker left the Moscow and St. Petersburg universities, ending his career as a professor of philosophy. Nikolai Lossky writes about this as follows: “Solovyov probably thought that an official position would prevent him from responding to all the burning issues of Russian political and religious life. Academic work did not satisfy him because it demanded concentration on purely scientific problems”.⁷¹ Pamela Davidson, in a recent article, analyzes Solovyov’s break with official academic circles in the light of Solovyov’s own ideal of a prophetic life. She writes about the public speech in which Solovyov spoke out against capital punishment and recommended that the new tsar pardon his father’s murderers in a spirit of Christian love: “This daring address to the state in the light of ethical religious ideals was very much in the prophetic tradition; it could certainly be seen as a turning-point, marking Solov’ev’s transition from private mystic and academic philosopher into the role of public preacher. Solov’ev himself seems to have regarded it in this light; in his brief autobiography of May 1887, he noted a telling sequence of events: soon after delivering this speech, he left his job at the Ministry, gave up his academic position and turned to concentrate on religious questions, particularly on the union of

⁶⁹ Ивановский В.Н. Методологическое введение в науку и философию, в 2-х т., Т. 1 — Минск, 1923. — С. 23. (Ivanovsky V. *Methodological Introduction into Science and Philosophy*, in 2 vols., vol. 1)

⁷⁰ Solovyov himself thought that the re-introduction of the chairs of philosophy at universities in 1863 was not enough, and, in his opinion, “philosophy in fact still has a shelter in the Spiritual Orthodox Academies only, far from the general current of life and society”. In 1880, he made an effort to establish the Russian Philosophical Society, and was one of its founders. Unfortunately, he was not successful. For details see: Соболев А.В. К истории религиозно философского общества памяти Владимира Соловьева // Историко-философский ежегодник — М: Наука, 1994. — С. 102. (Sobolev A. *On the History of the Religious and Philosophical Vladimir Solovyov Memorial Society // History of Philosophy. Yearbook-92*) Now, at the beginning of the 21st century, it is interesting to trace this influence, negative for the most part, but sometimes positive and even stimulating for thinkers. The pressure put on Russian philosophers and its representation in their texts would make a useful separate study.

⁷¹ Лосский Н.О. История русской философии — М. Советский писатель, 1991. — С. 95 (Lossky N.O. *History of Russian Philosophy*). The first edition was published in English in 1951.

the churches and the reconciliation of Judaism with Christianity”.⁷² Davidson’s analysis shows that a poetic and mystic intuition overruled the bright results of Solovyov’s academic career. It also allows me to venture a hypothesis that some poetic intuitions influenced Solovyov’s writing in his first academic work as well.

Another problem is connected to the material. Solovyov’s academic philosophical text is usually not very rich in connotations, and does not offer a “second meaning”.⁷³ As a result, linguistic and trope analysis becomes more simple, especially in comparison with an analysis of a text of literature or Solovyov’s own literary texts (play, verse, poem). It is harder to find a specific usage of a trope or metaphor in a purely academic text than in a literary text. I concentrate on Solovyov’s academic texts, although in works like *La Sophia*, *Three Conversations* and even in quite academic works like *Plato’s Life Drama* and *The Justification of the Good*, textual analysis can bring more results. I will also indicate some places for future analysis in these texts.

The characters (personages) in an academic philosophic narrative like *The Crisis* are reduced to their key ideas (theses). This is particularly relevant when an author writes about a long period in history of philosophy, reducing it in the text to a short sequence of crucial events. In turn, this increases the significance of the author’s interpretation of an event, thought, or idea. The role of the author’s vision becomes predominant and the author’s point of view is as important as in a novel or short story.⁷⁴ This

⁷²Davidson P. *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Ideal of Prophecy // The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 78, № 4 – Maney Publishing, 2000. – p. 651.

⁷³ “La connotation est la voie d’access à la polysémie du texte classique, à ce pluriel limite qui fonde le texte classique (il n’est pas sûr qu’il y ait des connotations dans le texte moderne)”. R. Barthes *S/Z* – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1967. – p. 14 (Барр Р. *S/Z* – М.: Ad marginem, 1994. – С. 16) See also: Barthes R. *Elements of Semiology* /Translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith/ – New York: The Noonday Press, 1992. – pp. 90–94.

⁷⁴ I understand the figure of the author in Solovyov’s texts as the author, Vladimir Solovyov. The concept of Narrator which is very suitable for traditional literature is not very helpful in this case. First of all, according to Wolfgang Kayzer, “the Narrator is a created figure, which belongs to the whole literary text” (Kayzer W. *Die Anfänge des modernen Romans im 18. Jahrhundert und seine heutige Krise // Deutch Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* – Stuttgart, 1954. – S. 417). I cannot say that there is “a created figure” of narrator in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. Roland Barthes reminds us that “the author of a tale cannot be confused with the narrator of this tale”. (Barthes R. *Introduction à l’analyse structural des récits // Communications*, 8, *L’analyse structurale du récit* – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – p.22).

also allows me to talk about a poetics of Solovyov's philosophy. It means that the analysis is focused on certain features of the subject of the narrative, the relationship between characters, tropes, and features of usage of language.

As a result, the terminology of my work is largely borrowed from literary studies. My only addition to the terminology of the literary studies is a definition of metaphor.⁷⁵ I wish to broaden the "formal" or "formalist" definition of metaphor and understand it as a "sense structure that gives the content characteristics of rationality".⁷⁶ I do not aim at making Solovyov's ideas and concepts more precise unless they are connected with the narrative analysis, nor do I wish to criticize someone else's ideas on Solovyov's philosophy. But I do hope to offer a new vision of his ideas through an analysis of the ways and opportunities of their representation in Solovyov's works.

I will concentrate on those works by Solovyov in which there is a significant element of history of philosophy and of philosophy of history; Solovyov regarded the latter from a Christian point of view. Also, I address the question of how Solovyov interprets some problems of a traditional history of ideas, and of facts of history. As I said, I am using White's *Metahistory* as an example of the approach to history as a type of writing. His method can be applied especially to texts on history and on philosophy of history, in which different systems of argumentation are used.⁷⁷ In my work, I use it for those parts of Solovyov's texts in which he gives interpretations of historical events. Solovyov very clearly intended to "give

⁷⁵ An example of multi-disciplinary studies of the role of metaphor in culture can be found in the work: Ricoeur P. *The Rule of Metaphor. Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language* – London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978. – p. 384.

⁷⁶ See Lev Gudkov's article *Metaphor* in the *Encyclopedia Cultural Studies. XX Century* (Гудков Л.Д. "Метафора" // Культурология. XX век. Энциклопедия – СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. – С. 36).

⁷⁷ White H. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* – London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – p. 7. (But such questions about the connections between events which make them elements in a story which can be followed should be distinguished from question of another sort: "What does it all add up to?", "What is the point of it all?" These questions have to do with the structure of the entire set of events considered as a completed story and call for a synoptic judgment of the relationship between a given story and other stories that might be "found", "identified", or "uncovered" in the chronicle. They can be answered in a number of ways. I call these ways (1) explanation by employment, (2) explanation by argument, (3) explanation by ideological implication.

a synthetic view on the general history of Mankind”,⁷⁸ to represent human history as a process of the development of Mankind towards positive All-unity. One of my purposes in this work is a formal analysis of Solovyov’s main ideas like All-unity, synthesis of philosophy, science, and religion, integral knowledge in his narrative, and his interpretations of them in the form of history of European philosophy, in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* in particular. The choice of Solovyov’s works for my investigation is determined by this purpose.

An ideology is usually an implicit part of any text, but it is largely concentrated at the level of elementary ideological structures, and sometimes, of terminology (for example, “God” in theology, and “The Absolute principle” in Hegel).⁷⁹ It rarely penetrates in deeper levels. It is better and easier to perform analytic operations with ideologies at the narrative level of a text where we can detect elements of historical description or the sequence of events. In Solovyov’s works, there are some elements of history, but they belong to history of philosophy or history of ideas, rather than to history proper. I will discuss Solovyov’s account of history of philosophy in section 2.4.

White has called his method “formalistic”, meaning that it does not take into account “the content of a form”, which is what a historian would interpret.⁸⁰ Generally speaking, “metahistory” as a theory of the interpretative work of a historian, and his mission as a mediator between “the historical field, the unprocessed historical record, other historical accounts and an audience” is based not on history (no matter how we understand it), but on the texts in which the meaning and significance of certain past events is stated.⁸¹ The metahistorical level is based on “the following levels of conceptualization in the historical work: (1) chronicle;

⁷⁸ Solovyov V. *The Philosophic Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьёв В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 177). If a work of Solovyov is not translated into English I mention a traditional translation of its title and the Russian edition I worked with. Because the complete academic collection of Solovyov’s works is only at the stage of preparation, and the published volumes contain many misprints, I used the most comprehensive modern edition of his works.

⁷⁹ This simple understanding of ideology as a set of ideas is suitable for narrative analysis. I borrowed this concept from Eco U. *The Role of the Reader. Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* – Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press, 1979. – p. 14.

⁸⁰ White H. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* – London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – p. 3.

⁸¹ Ibid. p. 5.

(2) story; (3) mode of emplotment; (4) mode of argument; and (5) mode of ideological implication”.⁸² The sequence of events separated from all interpretation (which, probably, exists only somewhere in the mind of a historian before the start of writing, because in the process of writing it already changes) is represented as the first step of the work of a historian, i.e. on the stage of converting “the set of events” (taken from a chronicle) into a story.

The more we advance on the way of re-shaping events into a history-narrative, the bigger becomes the role of metahistorical factors (not connected with the events themselves) that are already very close to philosophy, in the sense of abstract theoretical knowledge. At these stages of “emplotment”, argumentation and implication of ideologies, we are not capable, without a very scrupulous textual analysis, of making a distinction between the work of a historian, a philosopher of history, and a philosopher without a very scrupulous textual analysis. I would say that the logic of a plot influences the method of argumentation, and also the final choice of a philosophic point of view by an author. In that case, the mechanism or conceptual scheme, described by White, becomes a universal instrument for the analysis of “logocentric” texts.⁸³ Solovyov’s texts can be called logocentric, because there is a central plot or central topic, as was noted by several scholars. Sergei Bulgakov thought that it was the idea of “positive All-unity”.⁸⁴ Vasily Zenkovsky denied the idea that the philosophy of Solovyov had a single root, but he suggested that there was “a creative center in the work of his thought”, and this center was his metaphysics.⁸⁵

But in all interpretations there was something which unified his thought into a system. According to Dmitry Strémoukhov, it was “theoso-

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ The term “logocentrism” is “used by Derrida and other exponents of deconstruction to designate the desire for a centre or original guarantee for all meanings”. (Baldick C. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. – p. 125) Another definition given by Edward Arnold: “a belief in an extra systemic validity presence of Center which underwrites and fixes linguistic meaning but is itself beyond scrutiny or challenge”. (*A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory* /Edited by E.Arnold/ – London: Edward Arnold, 1992. – p. 162) A critique of the deconstructivist account of “logocentric” philosophy is in T.Lavine’s *The Interpretative Turn from Kant to Derrida: A Critique // History and Anti-History in Philosophy* /T.Lavine and V.Tejera, editors/ – Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989. – pp. 35–36.

⁸⁴ Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., т. 2 – Л.: Эро, 1991. – С. 18 (Zenzovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.).

⁸⁵ Ibid., vol. 2, p. 32.

phy” in the first period, then “theocracy”, and, finally, “theurgy”.⁸⁶ Nikolai Lossky in his *History of Russian Philosophy* speaks about “the life pursuit” of Solovyov.⁸⁷ Zenkovsky states that Solovyov’s works opened the “period of systems” in Russian philosophy⁸⁸ or, with respect to history of philosophy, it was “the replacement of the philosophic paradigm”.⁸⁹

Anyone who writes “History” (no matter of what it is a history: history of philosophy, literature, ideas, history of an event or of a period) is dealing with events and facts that are outside one’s mind, and thus has to select facts out of the flood of events, and emplot them into a (hi)story.⁹⁰ In this process of writing a historical text (not yet a literary text⁹¹), the past is represented as the text of a document. If the past has a textual nature, there is an “encounter of the thoughts of a historian and those of an author who wrote the text which is considered to be the source for the historian”.⁹² And this encounter takes place in the imaginative sphere of “the space-

⁸⁶ Strémooukhoff D. *Vladimir Soloviev et son oeuvre messianique* – Lausanne: L’Age d’Homme, 1976. – p. 8. (First published 1935)

⁸⁷ Лосский Н.О. История русской философии – М.: Советский писатель, 1991. – С. 107 (Lossky N. *History of Russian Philosophy*).

⁸⁸ Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., т. 2 – Л.: Эго, 1991. – С. 10 (Zenzovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.). There is a very interesting remark by Vasily Rozanov about the role of Solovyov: “All of them, Russian Philosophers before Solovyov, were as chapters of an Encyclopedic dictionary on philosophy, without any certain interest and without any certain point of view on everything. I can say that Solovyov destroyed this heartless and collective Encyclopedia and replaced it by the right and personal book, even the passionate book at some places. That is why he became the Philosopher”. (Розанов В.В. Около церковных стен, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – СПб., 1906. – С. 369; Rozanov V. *By the Church Walls*).

⁸⁹ Новикова Л.И., Сиземская И.Н. Русская философия истории – М.: Магистр, 1997. – С. 218 (Novikova L., Sizemskaya I. *Russian Philosophy of History*).

⁹⁰ White H. *The Historical Text as Literary Artifact* // White H. *Tropics of Discourse* – Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1978. – pp. 81–100.

⁹¹ I make this point, because there are some examples of literary analysis of texts that cannot be called texts of literature. I mean aforementioned books of Gossman L. *The Empire Unpossess’d. An Essay on Gibbon’s “Decline and Fall”* and Shiner L. *The Secret Mirror. Literary Form and History in Tocqueville’s Recollections*. The point of this analysis is a number of literary qualities of Tocqueville’s description of the events of the French Revolution of 1848 from the point of awitness and participant.

⁹² Гуревич А.Я. Территория историка // Одиссей. Человек в истории – М.: Coda, 1996. – С. 107 (Gurevich A. *The Territory of a Historian* // *Odyssey. Human in History*).

and-time of historical research”.⁹³ The idea of a dialogue between the consciousness of the author and that of his correspondents and characters was given by Mikhail Bakhtin, and ever since that time it has become a commonplace for discourse on the past.⁹⁴ In the case of my work, the reason is: Solovyov’s works, where different ideas, and concepts of philosophers of many epochs are in dialogue. And this dialogue unfolds in Solovyov’s works only when we read them. One can argue about the nature of the process of reading, and about who is actually participating in it.⁹⁵ But for the purpose of my work it is enough to say that the place of the dialogue has a clearly textual nature, because I analyze an imaginary dialogue between personages of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* which is composed by Solovyov.

From the point of view of a tradition, which divides textual sources into historical, biographical, or fictional, the application of a historiographic method to philosophical works requires more foundations, because we cannot simply equate a text of Solovyov with the concept of “the past” which is relevant for historians.⁹⁶ In comparison with “the past”, any text of Solovyov looks much more “real”.⁹⁷ Let me therefore see

⁹³ Ibid. p. 107 (Там же, С. 107). For more details see Ricoeur P. *Time and Narrative*, in 3 vols., vol.1 /Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer/ — Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1984 — pp. 52–87.

⁹⁴ Firstly stated in Bakhtin’s *Problems of Dostoyevsky’s Poetics* in the Chapter *The Hero and The Author’s Position in Relation to the Hero in Dostoyevsky’s Work* in the 1920s. The first Russian edition was published in 1928. (See Bakhtin M. *Problems of Dostoyevsky’s Poetics* / Transl. by Rotset R./ — Ardis, 1973. — p.38). Later the principle was extended into the theory of novel, which is already an exaggeration. Bakhtin’s approach to Dostoyevsky was absolutized and extrapolated to the novel as genre, but the principle of dialogue does not cover all novels. Nevertheless, see Bakhtin M. *The Dialogic Imagination by Mikhail Bakhtin. Four Essays* / Edited by M.Holquist/ — Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. — pp. 426–427.

⁹⁵ For details about the process of reading see: Iser W. *The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach // Modern Criticis and Theory. A Reader* /Edited by David Lodge/ — London and New York: Longman, 1988. — pp. 212–227.

⁹⁶ Ankersmit F.R. *History and Tropology. The Rise and Fall of Metaphor* — Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994. — p.6.

⁹⁷ “The historian, it may be said, is concerned with what does not exist. For his subject-matter is the past; and by definition, the past is not the present, and so no longer exists. To be sure, the historian tries to reconstruct the past; and his reconstruction exists in the present. But we are not in a position to compare the reconstruction with non-existent original. Even if therefore the reconstruction happens to be an objective representation of the past, we cannot know that it is. And what holds good for historiography in general also holds good for the history of philosophy in particular”. Copleston F. *Problems of Objectivity // On the History of Philosophy and Other Essays* — London: Search Press, 1979. — p. 40.

whether it is possible to find a similarity between the work and representation of different matters by a historian and philosopher. There is indeed an analogy between the work of a historian and that of a philosopher, especially a classical philosopher like Solovyov. At this point, I refer to Franklin Ankersmit who emphasized that “there is an affinity between philosophy of historical research and the components (statements) of a historical narrative”. Philosophy of historical writing and the historical narrative in its totality are similarly related.⁹⁸ If I accept Sergei Bulgakov’s idea that “positive All-unity” is the central theme of Solovyov’s philosophy,⁹⁹ I have to proclaim it the main subject of his works “in totality” and it helps me to apply Ankersmit’s analogy to Solovyov’s writing.

Let us take a closer look at this analogy: “Historical narratives are interpretations of the past. The task of a historian is mostly interpretative, i.e. the search of unity in diversity, his interpretation of the past is aimed at the unity which is the characteristic quality of things. The writing of history shares with metaphysics the explanatory effort, defining the essence of (part of) reality, but differs from metaphysics because of its nominalism”.¹⁰⁰ Ankersmit emphasizes the similarity between writing history and doing metaphysics. The difference is only the nominalism of the former. In metaphysics, the *nomina* (i.e. general concepts) are very important and metaphysicians (including Solovyov) try to find a positive content in names (like All-unity, Godmanhood). It led to a personification of abstract principles and imposing on them an absolute meaning (which for a contemporary

⁹⁸ Ankersmit F. R. *History and Tropology. The Rise and Fall of Metaphor* – Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994. – p.5.

⁹⁹ As I mentioned before, Sergei Bulgakov thought that it was “the main principle of all the philosophy of V.I. Solovyov, its alpha and omega” (Булгаков С.Н. Что дает современному сознанию философия Владимира Соловьева // Книга о Владимире Соловьеве – М.: Сов. писатель, 1991. – С. 389 (Bulgakov S. *What Does the Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov Give to the Modern Mind-set?*) Probably, Bulgakov based his conclusion on Solovyov’s article of 1894 *A First Step Towards Positive Aesthetics*, in which Solovyov writes: “So, there is a purpose of history (hence, of all the world process), which we, certainly, know – the universal purpose, and at the same time it is quite clear for us that we are able to participate in its achievements. With respect to each idea, each feeling and each human business, one can always reasonably and consciously decide, whether it suits the ideal of total solidarity or contradicts it, approaches a realization of true All-unity or resists it”. (Solovyov V. *A First Step Towards the Positive Aesthetics*. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 552).

¹⁰⁰ Ankersmit F.R. *History and Tropology. The Rise and Fall of Metaphor* – Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994. – p. 5.

researcher is a conventional question only). But for metaphysicians, the search for new metaphors and notions to define the essence of things is a vitally important part of their work, which they perform thoroughly. For example, when Solovyov, in his critique of Eduard von Hartmann, introduces “the concrete all-unifying spirit” as an absolute principle, I do not have the right to say that for me what Solovyov does here is just personification, hypostasization, etc. From Ankersmit’s point of view, Solovyov’s idea is a metaphysical one. For Solovyov it is metaphysical, too, and for him this is how it should be, whereas for Ankersmit this is a disqualification. I, however, do not intend to label the author’s intention (“the search for All-unity”, i.e. the purpose of his entire life and philosophy) as just a senseless linguistic game, or nonsense, because for Solovyov it was based on serious thought. And in that case, the analogy between the work of historian and philosopher found by Ankersmit is still relevant.

The extremes of metaphysics and nominalism are important for Ankersmit, and I do take them into account, but it was not important for Solovyov, who saw the positive sense in a search for unity in reality. The same applies to a historian who is interpreting the past which seems to him “metaphysical”¹⁰¹, and who believes in the positive (at least textual) sense of his own interpretation. If this analogy holds, we are entitled to apply the narrative analysis to classical texts of philosophy, i.e. to investigate them as “philosophical narratives”.

There is also the example of Frederick Jameson who extended the metaphor of “telling stories” to other spheres of humanities. In *The Vanishing Mediator; or, Max Weber as Storyteller*,¹⁰² he showed some features of Max Weber’s “sociological narrative” to be based on the structure of myth which is common to all narratives. Jameson’s most extreme statement in this connection is that even scientists like physicists “tell stories about nuclear particles”, a position confirmed by theoretical physicist Ilya Prigogine.¹⁰³ This proposition gives Jameson the opportunity to use the

¹⁰¹ I am using the concept “metaphysical” here in the sense that it does not exist anywhere apart from a historian’s mind. In order not to repeat Copleston’s aforementioned argument, I will mention Galina Zvereva’s phrase from her lecture: “I deal all my life with a thing which does not exist”.

¹⁰² Jameson F. *The Vanishing Mediator; or, Max Weber as Storyteller* // Jameson F. *The Ideologies of Theory. Essays 1971–1986*. vol. 2, Syntax of History – London: Routledge, 1988. – pp. 3–35.

¹⁰³ Jameson F. *The Political Unconscious* – London: Methuen, 1981. – p. 217. There are several authoritative works about narrativity of science: M. Landau,

label “social-symbolic act” for any, not only for literary narrative.¹⁰⁴ This means that, first, I can forget about the meaning of the text that I analyze, and just regard it as a text. From some hypothetical point of view, I even can argue that Solovyov’s works are literary and philosophical. In that case I can just refer to the texts of Solovyov themselves without defining their genre.

And, secondly, I can also avoid the permanent problem of a philosopher, namely the question, “what is philosophy?”, or “what do I mean by philosophy?” – (1) in a broad sense, where it usually borders on public recognition and opinion as being a discourse about things that “have worried and will be worrying Russians”¹⁰⁵, or (2) as “matter of a school only” (to use a metaphor of Solovyov), or (3) as “presumably, a matter of life and then a school”.¹⁰⁶ For my narrative in particular, I leave this question aside and work within another sphere where it is better for me to admit that philosophy is a set of complex texts.

1.2. The Necessity of a Methodological Turn in Scholarly Works on V.I. Solovyov¹⁰⁷

The paradigm of the “ideas, life, works, and opinions”¹⁰⁸ of such and such a Russian philosopher has exhausted its resources in the history of

Human Evolution as a Narrative, American Scientist, № 72, 1984. – p. 262; The note by Prigogine about the narrative nature of modern science further confirms this thesis: “Modern science is becoming more and more narrative. In the past there was a clear dichotomy: social science, presumably narrative, on the one hand, and science itself oriented at the search of laws of nature – on the other hand. At the present time this dichotomy is destroyed”. (Пригожин И. Философия неустойчивости // Вопросы философии – М.: Наука, 1991, № 6. – С.51) (Prigogine I. *Philosophy of Instability*)

¹⁰⁴ Jameson Fr. *The Political Unconscious* – London: Methuen, 1981. – p. 20. Jameson follows and develops Burke’s ideas expressed in his *The Philosophy of Literary Form. Studies in Symbolic Action* – New York: Vintage Books, 1957. – pp. 8–29.

¹⁰⁵ The phrase is from the rather academic work by Yevgeni Shaposhnikov (Шапошников Е.Л. Философские портреты – Н.Новгород, 1993. – С.7; (Shaposhnikov E. *Philosophical Portraits*))

¹⁰⁶ Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 179)

¹⁰⁷ I understand “the methodological turn” in the sense that Solovyov’s texts have to be looked at as meaning-systems in themselves, as texts with their own meaning and structure but not only the contexts and places for Solovyov’s major ideas that are already well-known. Apart from analysing a public profile of Solovyov, literature about him in Russian press of that time, his links to different people of his time, and literary qualities of his poems, we also have to look at

Russian philosophy.¹⁰⁹ The last productive example of a general retrospective approach in Solovyoviana (and I mean “productive” in the sense that this book was eventually published, after many years of delay) is Aleksei Losev’s encyclopedic book *Vladimir Solovyov and His Time*, 1990, published shortly after Losev’s death. This book marks a period of transition to case-

what he actually has written in his philosophical works. It is very similar of the reaction of the Russian Formalists on the positivist (historical) approach towards literary work (represented by Alexandr Veselovsky, first of all). Veselovsky established a system of literary genres in his *Historical Poetics*, which was published first as *The Three Chapters from Historical Poetics* in 1899. The Formalists came “back to the texts themselves” before a division into genres and history of genres.

¹⁰⁸ I call this the retrospective conception, in John Passmore’s sense. For details of the retrospective conception of history of philosophy, and its significant connection to doxographical tradition, see Passmore J. *The Idea of a History of Philosophy // History and Theory*—The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965. — pp. 22–23.

¹⁰⁹ I would not say so with respect to public problems and discussions that are connected with such a metaphysical thing as the Russian Idea, the future of Russia, “what is to be done”, “who is guilty” and the like (see the chapter “The Russian Idea in the 20th Century” in the book of Olga Volkogonova *The Image of Russia in the Russian Philosophy in the Emigration*—M.: Russian Political Encyclopedia, 1998. — pp. 269–307 (Волкогонова О.Д. Образ России в философии русского зарубежья—М.: РОССПЭН, 1998. —С. 269–307) The latest example of a reflection in this style is the article of a very authoritative writer: Хоружий С.С. Наследие Владимира Соловьева сто лет спустя // Журнал Московской патриархии, № 11—М., 2000.—С. 69–83 (Khoruzhy S. *The Heritage of Vladimir Solovyov Hundred Years Later*). Khoruzhy revises the symbolic (canonical) images of Solovyov in Russian culture of the 20th century. Applying a deconstructive method, he confirms Solovyov’s opinion about the failure of several of his projects and prophetic intuitions. Reading of this article, which uses terminology up-to-date and new for Solovyoviana actively, leaves the impression that everyone has created a wrong image of the philosopher, including Solovyov himself, that the result of hundred years of reception of Solovyov in Russian, Soviet, emigration and post-Soviet culture is doubtful and needs an “additional reconstruction” (Ibid. p. 82). That is why I took distance from the project of deconstruction from the beginning; apart from the feeling of a disastrous failure it cannot bring any clarity to the question when public, professional, ideological and utopian expectations are not separated from each other, as in the case of Solovyov’s philosophy in modern Russia. The only positive result of Khoruzhy’s article is that all the images of Solovyov (first, an image created by the Symbolists) in modern Russian culture and public opinion are stable, in spite of Russian emigration philosophy’s “break with Solovyov”, the Soviet’s “fighting with Solovyov”, and the “suffocating post-Soviet lie”. It just proves that within Russian religious philosophy the above-mentioned deconstructive project turns out to be useless, since it is based, for some reason, not on “good reading” but first and foremost, on criticism of Russian history of the 20th century.

study approach to problems connected with Solovyov. Because of the Soviet attitude towards Solovyov and religious philosophy, the book appeared many years after it was actually planned and prepared. The author did not take into account many of Solovyov's texts published in the West, because he did not know about them, and this is an obvious weakness of the book. There are many interesting analyses, comparisons, and remarks based on Losev's intuition and erudition only.¹¹⁰ The Christian – Neoplatonic bias of Losev, while acceptable for the 1920s-1930s when the book was planned, was already obsolete in the 1980s-1990s, when it was published. Anyway, after this book,¹¹¹ it is hardly possible to write a more comprehensive volume about Solovyov.¹¹²

I will not emphasize the difference between Russian and Western conditions of publication of works about Solovyov, although they certainly are different, and the abnormality of Soviet philosophical culture, as well as of normalization of Russian philosophical culture in post-Soviet period, are important in this connection.¹¹³ In the case of a general analysis of works on Solovyov they should be taken into account. But my discussion of works on Solovyov is strictly limited by the narrative analysis I perform here. I mention the works which were important to me for development of the narrative approach in Solovyoviana. Otherwise I am at risk of committing myself to discussion with dozens of scholars, instead of analysis of Solovyov's works.

I admit that existing surveys of literature on Solovyov in Russian works are not sufficient. The most comprehensive survey of general works in Russian on Solovyov's philosophy I have found starts with the Trubetskoi brothers and ends with reports on the 19th World Philosophical Congress (Moscow, 22–29th of August 1993) at the colloquium *The Problem of the*

¹¹⁰ Especially chapters *The Sources of Solovyov's Works* and *Philosophical and Literary Context*. (Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 164–205; 479–600 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*)).

¹¹¹ *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time* is written by the philosopher who received the freshly-published Collection of Solovyov's works as a prize in school in the 1910's, and dreamt all his long life about writing and publishing a book on Solovyov and his philosophy.

¹¹² Ibid. p. 697. (Там же. С. 697).

¹¹³ For details, see Zweerde E. van der *The Normalization of the History of Philosophy in Post-Soviet Russian Philosophical Culture // The Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*, vol. XII – Boston: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2001. – pp. 99–102.

Unity of Mankind in Russian Philosophy; it comprises 11 pages.¹¹⁴ But the bibliography of works about Solovyov, compiled by Kristi Groberg, is also not quite complete, and consists of about 150 pages.¹¹⁵

I want to start with a work in which, in my opinion, the author comes very close to the textual analysis I perform here, although it is still limited by “genre prejudice”, and does not extend analysis to other texts of Solovyov. Judith Kornblatt actually does an analysis of Solovyov’s works from the perspective of literary studies, “asks literary questions” and is “justified in employing literary-critical tools on his last famous work”.¹¹⁶ Her article “*Solovyov on Salvation*” is an example of how much “Solovyov’s most literary work except for poems”¹¹⁷ reveals for literary studies. It is easier to see the contrast between a traditional analysis of Solovyov’s doctrine of Salvation by Richard Gustafson¹¹⁸ in the same book and Kornblatt’s approach to *Three Conversations* as Solovyov’s concrete text about Salvation. It turns out that Gustafson’s approach is a kind of survey of many texts, but the logic of the separate texts cannot be traced back to them. The advantage of Kornblatt’s study on the same topic, which is more focused on a concrete text, is that it allows us to see the “peripeteias” of the story about the Antichrist in Solovyov’s text; this is certainly something new and without parallel in studies of Russian philosophy, if not in the analysis of philosophy in general.

In Davidson’s article we find an analysis of Solovyov’s prophetic intuitions and their philosophical justifications. The author does not separate Solovyov’s poetry and philosophical works. She often uses both of

¹¹⁴ Бондарев П.Б. *Философия истории Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук* – Краснодар, 1996. – С. 6–17 (Bondarev P. *Vladimir Solovyov’s Philosophy of History*, PhD Dissertation, pp.6–17).

¹¹⁵ *Vladimir Sergeievich Solovy’ev. A Bibliography*, Compiled by Kristi A. Groberg. Several Russian dissertations on Solovyov, many small articles on Solovyov in local editions sponsored by Russian and Ukrainian provincial universities, and even books on Solovyov by Didorenko S. and Savin Y. (see Bibliography at the end of this study) are not mentioned in Groberg’s bibliography.

¹¹⁶ Kornblatt J. *Solovyov on Salvation. The Story of the “Short Story of the Antichrist” // Russian Religious Thought* – London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. – p. 71

¹¹⁷ Milosz C. *Introduction // Solovyov V. War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ* – Hudson, New York: Lindisfarne Press, 1990. – p. 11.

¹¹⁸ Gustafson R. *Soloviev’s Doctrine of Salvation // Russian Religious Thought* – London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. – pp. 31–47.

them equally as sources. This gives a very interesting example of an approach to Solovyov's works as a whole, without a preliminary division into poetical and philosophical components of his doctrine. Davidson analyses "the way in which Solov'ev constructed his ideal and came to be regarded as a prophetic figure in his own right".¹¹⁹ She analyses Solovyov's life and image in the context of the Russian traditional vision of a writer as a divinely inspired prophet and the assessments of Solovyov's prophetic image by different writers (Vyacheslav Ivanov, Sergei Solovyov, Lev Shestov).¹²⁰ Davidson in her analysis shifts from the question "what is it?" to the question "how is it constructed?" In my opinion, this is a significant change in scholars' approach towards Solovyov's works, and my own work is also an attempt to shift from the problem "what is written?" to "how is it written?"

Some authors have achieved a non-traditional lay-out of problems by using the combinatory possibilities of philosophical terminology, and in this may have achieved something new. I would like to mention the works of Russian researchers of the 1990s, G.Asanbayeva, S.Gutova, A.Koletvintsev, N.Lapshova, Y.Savin, M.Potapenko.¹²¹

Potapenko's dissertation shows that Solovyov "as a poet and romanticist stands very close to the artistic, more universal means of expression,

¹¹⁹ Davidson P. *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Ideal of Prophecy // The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 78, N. 4 – Maney Publishing, 2000. – p. 644.

¹²⁰ Ibid. pp. 645–659.

¹²¹ Асанбаева Г.Д. Гуманизм этики Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М., 1990. – С. 174 (Asanbayeva G. *Humanism of Vladimir Solovyov's Ethics*, PhD dissertation); Гутова С.Г. Мистический рационализм в философии всеединства Вл. Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – Екатеринбург, 1994. – С.149. (Gutova S., *Mystic Rationalism in Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy of All-Unity*. PhD dissertation); Колетвинцев А.Н. Философия нравственности Вл Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М., 1991. – С.204 (Koletvintsev A. *VI. Solovyov's Philosophy of Ethics*, PhD dissertation); Лапшова Н.И. К проблеме смысловой интерпретации философских определений В.Соловьева // Русская философия: новые решения старых проблем. Ч.1 – СПб, 1993. – С. 41–44. (Lapshova N. *On the Problem of Interpretation of Philosophical Definitions by VI. Solovyov // Russian Philosophy: New Solutions of Old Problems*); Савин Ю.Г. Гносеология истины в трудах Вл.Соловьева. – М. Международная академия наук. Институт проблем ноокоsmологии. 1996. – С. 63.(Savin Y. *Epistemology of Truth in VI.Solovyov's Works*); Потاپенко М. И. Эстетичность основных философских идей Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук. – М.: МГУ, 1997. – С. 204 (Potapenko M. *The Aesthetic Quality of Vladimir Solovyov's Main Ideas*, PhD Dissertation).

and, as a utopian thinker, couldn't not (sic!, I.S.) get close to them in his world-view".¹²² Apart from the fact that it is a clear example of the kind of vague language some scholars use in writing about Solovyov, I would like to mention that the author has implicitly moved towards recognition of Solovyov's works as a group of brilliant texts¹²³ that can be analyzed from the aesthetic point of view, and the aesthetic content of these texts can be looked at thoroughly.¹²⁴ I think this is a step toward recognition of works of Solovyov as possible objects of aesthetic analysis.¹²⁵

Another interesting sample of a new approach to Solovyov's works can be found in Kirill Faradzhev's *Vladimir Solovyov: Mythology of the Image*, in which he analyzes Solovyov's creative structures, intuitions and ideals.¹²⁶ He does this without any preliminary division of Solovyov's works into genres, and applies the romantic concept of creation to Solovyov's texts as a whole. Of course, this book belongs to the genre of free reflections, having but minimal bibliography, and cannot claim serious findings in Solovyov's texts; still Faradzhev's attempt at finding "a dependence between the features of the – already – mythological personality of the author and

¹²² Потапенко М. И. Эстетичность основных философских идей Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М.: МГУ, 1997. – С. IX (Potapenko M. *The Aesthetic Quality of Vladimir Solovyov's Main Ideas*; PhD dissertation).

¹²³ The authors of the article *Solovyov V. S.* in *Russian Philosophy. Encyclopedia* (Русская философия. Малый энциклопедический словарь – М.: Наука, 1995. – С. 478 (*Russian Philosophy. Encyclopedia*)) state that his "philosophic system was the speculative "justification" of his moral and life searches and mythical-poetic dreams". It is a sign of an acceptance of the fact that Solovyov's philosophy was a product of poetic dreams.

¹²⁴ Moreover, there is a substantial aesthetic element in Solovyov's philosophical system and his public image; Georgi Florovsky wrote about this in his *Ways of Russian Theology*: "for his contemporaries Solovyov, first and foremost, was a philosopher: a religious idealist, confessor and the prophet of the better world. For the younger generation he became a mystic and poet" (Georges Florovsky *La tentation de l'esthétique chez Soloviev* // Vladimir Guettée, *Lettre à Soloviev. La Russie et son Eglise* – Fraternité Orthodoxe Saint Grégoire Palamas, 1997. – p. 42.).

¹²⁵ I especially would like to mention the definition of the Russian Idea in this dissertation: "Russian Idea is – if you want – first of all, the aesthetic interpretation and an attempt at re-construction of the Human Being in Russia" (Потапенко М.И. Эстетичность основных философских идей Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук. – М.: МГУ, 1997. – С. 202 (Potapenko M. *The Aesthetic Quality of Vladimir Solovyov's Main Ideas*, p. 202)).

¹²⁶ Фараджев К.В. Владимир Соловьев. Мифология образа – Москва: Араф, 2000. – С. 155. (Faradzhev K. *Vladimir Solovyov: Mythology of Image*).

the details of his works”¹²⁷ looks very interesting. The obvious defect of this book is that sometimes quotations from Solovyov are not indicated, and it is difficult to grasp which of Solovyov’s work is actually quoted, and whether Faradzhev is talking about a concrete work or about Solovyov’s works and ideas in general. It confirms my statement in section 1.2 about the lack of formal elaboration in Russian philosophy. But we have to take into consideration the genre of the book and its purpose to attract the mass reader.

Looking back at the 1970’s–1980’s, one can say that even in the Soviet Union there was an opportunity for surveying and analysing some aspects of Solovyov’s philosophy¹²⁸ and, sometimes, even his philosophy as a whole,¹²⁹ though mostly in the form of criticism like that of S. Baranov’s dissertation, *A Critique of the Social and Political Aspects of Vl. Solovyov’s Philosophic and Religious Conception*,¹³⁰ a work blamed many years later in another dissertation as “one-sided and of a shameful quality”.¹³¹

¹²⁷ Ibid. p.4 (Там же.С. 4).

¹²⁸ Спириов В.В. Философия истории Вл.Соловьева в ее развитии и преимственности /Исторические судьбы одной теократической утопии/: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М.: МГУ, 1969. – С.209. (Spirov V. *Vl.Solovyov’s Philosophy of History in its’ Development and Receptivity /Historical Fate of a Theocratic Utopia /* PhD dissertation) Many years later one more dissertation appeared on the same theme: Бондарев П.Б. Философия истории Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – Краснодар, 1996. – С. 136 (Bondarev P. *Vladimir Solovyov’s Philosophy of History*, PhD Dissertation). It is worth mentioning the works of Turenko Y. *The Critique of Vl.Solovyov’s Conception of the History of Philosophy*; PhD dissertation (Туренко Ю.Д. Критика историко-философской концепции Вл.Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук. – М., 1971. – С. 228) and Bakradze A. *The Problem of Man in V. Solovyov’s Philosophy /Critical Analysis/*; PhD dissertation (Бакрадзе А.Т. Проблема человека в философии В.Соловьева /Критический анализ/: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – Тбилиси, 1972. – С.204).

¹²⁹ Бушуров Г.К. Философия В.С. Соловьева \Критический анализ\ Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – Л., 1973. – С. 219. (Bushurov G. *Vladimir Solovyov’s Philosophy /A Critical Analysis/*; PhD Dissertation).

¹³⁰ Баранов С.Т. Критика социально-политических аспектов философско-религиозной концепции Вл. Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук. – Ставрополь, 1974. – С. 114 (Baranov S. *A Critique of Social and Political Aspects of Vl. Solovyov’s Philosophic and Religious Conception*). PhD dissertation where the author states that “Solovyov played the role of a religious reformer”, p. 14). Nonetheless it was mentioned positively in the work by Boikov V. *Vl. Solovyov: Pro et contra. Personality and Works of Vladimir Solovyov in Works of Russian Thinkers and Researchers* – St. Petersburg: Russian Chris-

By the end of the 1980s, all censorship restrictions had disappeared and people started either to reflect within the traditional paradigm of Russian philosophy, or to find new and original ways of expression. Presently, there is a sound balance (normalization) in Russian literature of works on Solovyov made in the traditional style and attempts by several scholars to introduce new approaches to Russian philosophy and new facts of the biographies of Russian philosophers.¹³² As I already mentioned, there are fresh approaches to Solovyov's philosophy in both Russian and non-Russian traditions. Generally speaking, things like new approaches (literary studies, deconstruction, case-studies) are happening in the West more often, because in order to introduce things like "deconstruction" to the Russian academic audience one has to have the titles and authority of a Sergei Khoruzhy.¹³³ The deconstructivist analysis of Solovyov's liberalism¹³⁴ and how this liberalism is expressed in different works is still to come.

tian Humanitarian Institute Press, 2000. — p. 25. Бойков В.В. Соловьиная песнь русской философии // Владимир Соловьев: *Pro et contra*. Личность и творчество Владимира Соловьева в оценке русских мыслителей и исследователей. Антология — СПб.: Изд-во Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 2000. — С. 25.

¹³¹ Болдырев В.И. Судьба России в философии Вл. Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд филос. наук — М., 1993. — С. 137. (Boldyrev V. *The Fate of Russia in Vl. Solovyov's Philosophy*; PhD dissertation).

¹³² "On the whole, historiography of philosophy thus shows clear signs of normalization. First, the textual basis is in the process of being restored. Furthermore, research on Solovyov is becoming increasingly text-oriented, separating historical facts from philosophical interpretation". (Zweerde E. van der *The Normalization of the History of Philosophy in Post-Soviet Russian Philosophical Culture* // *The Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*, vol. 12 — Boston: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2001. — p. 102).

¹³³ See the author's remarks and methodological introduction in the article: Хоруужий С.С. Наследие Владимира Соловьева сто лет спустя // Журнал Московской патриархии, N 11 — М., 2000. — С. 73 (Khoruzhy S. *The Heritage of Vladimir Solovyov Hundred Years Later*). My own experience of deconstructing Solovyov's imperial and monarchical vision at a conference of young scholars in 1999 caused an authoritative scholar's statement that Solovyov was a liberal. I just wanted to prove that Solovyov's vision of the Christian empire in a paragraph in *The Justification of the Good* (Solovyov V. *The Justification of the Good* — Edinburgh, R. & R. Clark, 1918. — pp 389–393 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 1 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 466–469)) was monarchical, and this does not contradict Solovyov's being a liberally-minded author.

¹³⁴ It is a debatable question, because in the late period of his life Solovyov was close to liberals and their publication *Vestnik Evropy* (The European Messenger). At the same time he was not liberal enough for them: "Despite all his love for Solovyov, Stasyulevich (the editor-in-chief of *Vestnik Evropy*, I.S.) refused to publish in his progressive magazine the monologues of the General, from the

Nowadays, it is difficult to find a substantial theme in Solovyoviana that has not yet been described. Sometimes it happens that researchers put the same thought in similar words.¹³⁵ Generally speaking, Solovyoviana is becoming a theme in studies in the history of ideas and the history of everyday life. In Russia, this field has been covered with the term *Kulturologiya*.¹³⁶

standpoint of religious conceptions of everyday life". Solovyov's last work was not suitable for *Vestnik Evropy*, and had to take refuge in the modest edition *Knizhki nedeli* (Weekly Books) (Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция — М.: Республика, 1997. — С.388. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*))

¹³⁵ As it happened in the two authoritative books: Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 194. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*); Лазарев В.В. Философия Соловьева и Шеллинг // Философия Шеллинга в России /под редакцией В. Пустарнакова/ — СПб.: Издательство Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 1998. — С.479 (Lazarev V. *Solovyov's Philosophy and Schelling* // *Schelling's Philosophy in Russia* /Edited by V.Pustarnakov/, p. 479). I guess Lazarev has repeated Losev's words probably knowing them.

¹³⁶ A monument to *Kulturologiya* is left in Solovyoviana by the title of the dissertation: Киейзик Л. Культурологические идеи Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. культурологии — Ростов на Дону, 1998. — С. 221. (Kiejzik L. *Culturological Ideas of Vladimir Solovyov*; PhD dissertation). I do not have anything against the basic "culturological" terminology of this dissertation and the author's reflections about Solovyov's role in Russian culture. The term "culturology" was coined by an American anthropologist Leslie White in the 1950s (See White L. *The Science of Culture: a Study of Man and Civilization* — New York: Grove Press, 1958 — XX, p. 444) and was adopted for a Russian university discipline in the 1990's alongside other English terms which came to Russian life at that time: the White House, Senate and senators, speaker, Independence Day, etc. My only concern is that the titles of several chapters are closely linked to *Kulturologiya*. For example, if one does not know what *Kulturologiya* is, it would be hard to grasp an idea of the chapters *VI. Solovyov — the Creator of Integral Philosophic-culturological System*, or *The Relation of the Artistic and the Conceptual Moments as A Culturological Aspect of Solovyov's Philosophy*; today the attempt to find "culturological aspects" in Solovyov's philosophy looks like an anachronism. In spite of the terminology Kiejzik employs, the results of her works are valuable. She investigates Solovyov's role in Russian culture — "Solovyov's place as a one who theoretically expressed the mindset of the culture of the second half of the 19th century; concepts of Solovyov's works; ethnocultural aspects of Solovyov's ideas; cultural significance of Solovyov's religious and confessional search". (Ibid. p.11) My only objection is that Solovyov was not "a large scale *kulturolog*," as well as not *kulturolog* at all, as Kiejzik claims, (Ibid. p.13) first of all, because, in comparison with her and myself, he did not receive a degree in *Kulturologiya*. About *Kulturologiya* see A. Fliyer's article *Kulturologiya* in the Encyclopedia *Cultural Studies. XX Century* — S.Petersburg, Universtity Book (Флиер А.Я. Культурология // Культурология. XX век. Энциклопедия — СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. — С.371—374).

Such a broad perspective of approaches and such an extensive study of the details of Solovyov's life and work yields a new meta-language for description of the facts of Russian intellectual history and of the everyday life of Russian philosophers. One option for the extension of the field of studies on Solovyov is connected with his everyday life, and research on the particular details of his life without any direct link to his philosophy of All-unity or to other basic intuitions. This continues a biographic tradition started by Solovyov's close friends Vladimir Velichko and Sergei Lukyanov who did not write about his philosophy (or at least did not analyze it in details), but mentioned many interesting facts and peculiarities of his life.¹³⁷ This tradition deserves to be continued and extended to other periods of Solovyov's life. In this manner, it is possible to include almost endless sources and remarks about life in the second half of the 19th century. The latest achievements of this trend and approach are the dissertation of Boris Mezhuyev which "aims to clarify to which degree Solovyov's philosophy of All-unity depends on different trends of Russian thought of the 1870s-1990s",¹³⁸ and the article by the same author, introducing new materials: obituaries on Solovyov in Russian press of 1900.¹³⁹ This is the first of possible ways that Solovyov studies can be developed; the methodology of this trend is based on case-study research of the facts of Solovyov's biography.

Another close friend of Solovyov, Yevgeni Trubetskoi, has established a tradition of profound analysis of Solovyov's philosophy (with a significant

¹³⁷ Величко В.Л. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творение – СПб., 1903 – С. 208. (Velichko V. *VI. Solovyov. Life and Works*). Even so this book deserved the negative remark of Nilolai Kareyev, another close friend of Solovyov who studied with him in school (*gymnasium*) and university (Кареев Н.И. Прожитое и пережитое – Ленинград: Изд-во Ленинградского университета, 1990. – С. 102 (N.Kareyev *My Past and Lived Through*)); Лукьянов С.М. О Вл.С. Соловьеве в его молодые годы. В 3-х т., Т. 1 – М.: Книга, 1990. (Lukyanov S. *On VI. S. Solovyov in his Youth*).

¹³⁸ Межуев Б.В. Отечественные истоки философии В.С.Соловьева (Социокультурный контекст 70–90-х годов 19 века): Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М.: 1997. – С. 208 (Mezhuyev B. *The Russian Sources of Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy (Socio-cultural Context of the 70s-90s of the 19th Century*; PhD dissertation).

¹³⁹ Межуев Б.В. К проблеме поздней "Эстетики" В.С.Соловьева (Опыт чтения газетных некрологов) // Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1998 под ред. М.А.Колерова – М.: ОГИ, 1998. – С. 543. (Mezhuyev B. *On the Problem of VI.Solovyov's Late Aesthetics (Reading of the Obituaries in the Press)* // *Researches on the History of Russian Thought*, Yearbook-1998).

element of Solovyov's biography), which, in my opinion, needs to find a way of further development. First of all, the methodological base of this tradition has not been developed among Russian authors since Trubetskoi's time, and we hardly can find any elaboration of methodology of their research in the works of Sergei Solovyov, Lukyanov, Mochulsky, Zenkovsky, Strémoukhoff, Losev, Shaposhnikov, Serbinenko, and Faradzhev. Secondly, such a tradition is deeply rooted in Russian philosophy, and the authors mostly did not care about the historical setting of Solovyov's works, their historical context and manner of presentation. They did not reflect on possible approaches to Solovyov's philosophical and literary works and on their own methods. But after the "internationalization" of Russian Solovyov studies it has become necessary to elaborate on methods of historical research in this area, as well as to provide critical reflection on these.

There are two ways out of the present crisis in this type of analysis: (1) extension of the field of studies to the details of Solovyov's everyday life, and connecting these to his main ideas, or the ideas of other philosophers; (2) new strategies in analysis of known texts and of the facts of his biography; the latter is what I am trying to do in this work. Case-study analysis of some works of Solovyov or a group of his texts on the same topic (an approach which has been well developed in literary studies) allows me to combine the strong points of both strategies.¹⁴⁰ I extend the basis of Solovyov studies in the sense that I perform an analysis of parts of Solovyov's texts which have been neglected.¹⁴¹ In section 2.1, I will analyse most of available accounts of *The Crisis* and their respective object of interest. On the one hand, it is the only way to penetrate the details of Solovyov's life and work, and their representation in a text. On the other hand, it is a good place to try new strategies closely connected with, and

¹⁴⁰ Kornblatt J. D. *Vladimir Solov'ev on Spiritual Nationhood. Russia and the Jews // The Russian Review. An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present*—The Ohio State University Press, vol. 56, Oct. 1996. — pp. 157–177. See also Gustafson R. *Soloviev's Doctrine of Salvation // Russian Religious Thought* — London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. — pp. 31–47.

¹⁴¹ Generally speaking, the authors who analyzed *The Crisis* in the context of Solovyov's works were focused on the first pages of Chapter I and the conclusive pages of Chapter V. The only exception is George Kline's *Hegel and Solovyov // Hegel and the History of Philosophy. Proceedings of the 1972 Hegel Society in America Conference* /edited by J. O'Malley and others/ — The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974. — pp. 159–170. In a few pages Kline gives a survey of *The Crisis* in order to prove that Solovyov's philosophical and metaphysical "systems were profoundly influenced by Hegel" (p. 159).

dependent on the concrete texts. Case-study analysis is taking its place in Solovyov studies.¹⁴² Collections of small articles on different aspects of Solovyov's work and life have been published in France and the Ukraine.¹⁴³

The second chapter of my dissertation is an attempt at this kind of analysis.

There are also some achievements in spreading the field of studies.¹⁴⁴ However, the "partition" (Roland Barthes' term) of Solovyov's works

¹⁴² In his book *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*, Losev was the first in Russian Solovyov studies who did *A Critical Survey of Solovyov's Works*, including *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* (Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 135–137 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*). There is an analysis of Solovyov's *La Russie et l'église universelle* in the work: Poulin F. Vladimir Solov'ev's *Russia i vselennaya tserkov'*, *Early Slavophilism's Pneumatic Spirit, and the Pauline Prophet* // *The Russian Review. An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present*, vol 52, N 4 — The Ohio State University Press, 1993. — pp. 528–539.

¹⁴³ Guibert F.-X. de l'Éditeur/ *Œcuménisme et Eschatologie selon Soloviev*— Paris: Sagesse chrétienne, 1994. — p. 181; Творчість Володимира Соловйова в контексті культури срібного віку. Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції — Дрогобич, 1998. — С. 240. (*Vladimir Solovyov's Works in the Context of Culture of the "Silver Age"*) This book can be called a set of case-studies and reflections (theses) in the sense that most of its authors reflect on the separate aspects of Solovyov's works. But there are case-studies and there are reflections on a topic. For example, Vladimir Voznyak's work on the topic Владимир Соловьев о различении рассудка и разума // Творчість... С. 19–22. (Voznyak V. *Vladimir Solovyov on the Distinction Between Mind and Reason*) makes sense as a case-study, because Solovyov actually treats this distinction a few times in *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* and *A Critique of Abstract Principles*. At the same time, Valentina Mazurina's text Философское осмысление Вечной Женственности Владимиром Соловьевым // Творчість... С. 36–40 (Mazurina V. *Solovyov's Philosophical Interpretation of the Eternal Womanhood*) is about a major topic in Solovyoviana (see: Samuel Cioran's *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Knighthood of the Divine Sophia* — Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1977; the newly published book by Toinet P. *Vladimir Soloviev. Chevalier de la Sophia* — Genève: Editions Ad Solem, 2001. — 236 p.; and a short survey of this problem in Solovyov in the chapter *The Feminist Issue and the Idea of God* in Dahm H. *Vladimir Solovyev and Max Scheler: Attempt at a Comparative Interpretation. A Contribution to the History of Phenomenology* /Translated from the German by Kathleen Wright/ — Dordrecht-Holtnad/Boston- USA: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1975. — pp. 162–177.), when it is only reflected on 4 pages with 4 items of bibliography, and it is not a case-study.

¹⁴⁴ Boris Mezhuiev's dissertation deals with Mikhail Karinsky's and Nikita Gilyarov-Platonov's works as sources of Solovyov's philosophy. See Межуев Б.В. Отечественные истоки философии В.С.Соловьева (Социокультурный контекст 70–90-х годов 19 века): Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук — М.: МГУ, 1997. — С. 100 — 120. (Mezhuyev B. *The Russian Sources of Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy (Socio-cultural Context of the 70–90's of the 19th Century)*; PhD dissertation).

among different forms of research has not yet taken place, as it did for the classic literary works of Pushkin, Dostoevsky or Lev Tolstoi.¹⁴⁵ The academic philosophical works of Solovyov have not yet become a subject of literary studies, in spite of the pertinent remark of Vasily Rozanov (who was almost completely forgotten during the Soviet period) in his *Mimoletnoye* (Short Remarks): “He was a WRITER – and his passions and literary temperament had a great influence – on philosophy. He flooded

¹⁴⁵ Although some works divide texts of Solovyov and are focused narrowly on some particular topics. This trend started with the article of A.Yashchenko on Solovyov's philosophy of law, published in 1912 and reprinted in 1999. See: Ященко А.С. Философия права Владимира Соловьева – СПб.: Алетеия, 1999. – С. 17–52 (Yashchenko A. *Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy of Law*, first Russian publication in 1912). The latest examples of this trend are: Moss W. *Vladimir Soloviev and the Jews in Russia* // *The Russian Review. An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present*, vol 29, N 2, – The Ohio State University Press, 1970. – pp. 181–191; Осипова Л.Ф. К вопросу об эволюции эсхатологических концепций В.Соловьева // Вестник московского университета, № 3 – М.: МГУ, 1972. – С. 72. (Osipova L. *The Evolution of V.Solovyov's Eschatological Conception* // *Messenger of Moscow State University*, № 3, 1972); Барковская Е.Ю. Владимир Соловьев: Взгляд на мусульманский мир // Вестник РАН, т. 63, № 10 – М.: Наука, 1993. – С. 913–917 (Barkovskaya E. *Vladimir Solovyov: The View on the Muslim World* // *Vestnik (Messenger) of the Russian Academy of Science*); Болдырев В.И. Глобальные проблемы человечества в “Метафизике всеединства” В.Соловьева // Философия и кризис современной цивилизации – М., 1993. – С. 215–227 (Boldyrev V. *Global Human Problems in Vladimir Solovyov's “Metaphysics of All-unity”* // *Philosophy and the Crisis of Modern Civilization*); Вишневецкий И. Владимир Соловьев как естественный мыслитель // Аequinox – М.: Книжный сад, 1993. – С. 230–236 (Vishnevetsky I. *Vladimir Solovyov as a Natural Thinker* // *Aequinox*, 1993); Лапшова Н.И. К проблеме смысловой интерпретации философских определений В.Соловьева // Русская философия: новые решения старых проблем. Ч.1 – СПб, 1993. – С.41–44. (Lapshova N. *On the Problem of Interpretation of Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophical Definitions* // *Russian Philosophy: New Solutions to Old Problems*); Левин Ю.И. Инвариантные структуры в философском тексте: Вл.Соловьев // Серебряный век в России – М., 1993. – С. 5–86 (Levin Y. *Invariant Structures in Vl.Solovyov's Philosophic Text* // *The Silver Age in Russia*); Свиридова Г.И. Вопросы государственного устройства в наследии В.Соловьева // Российская государственность: этапы становления и развития. Ч.2 – Кострома, 1993. – С.31–36 (Sviridova G. *Problems of the State in Solovyov's works* // *The Russian State. Stages of the Process of Development*. Part 2); Carlson M. Gnostic Elements in the Cosmogony of Vladimir Soloviev // Kornblatt J. D. and Gustafson /Editors/ *Russian Religious Thought* – London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. – pp. 49–67. Kornblatt J. D. *Soloviev's Attraction to Kabbala: Godmanhood and Adam Kadmon* in Chapter III *Russian Religious Thought and Jewish Kabbala* // *The Occult in Russian and Soviet Culture*. /Edited by Bernice Rosenthal/ – Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1997. – pp. 82–87.

onto philosophy as ocean water floods onto a continent and washed away “philosophic themes” by means of his writer’s language and literary soul”.¹⁴⁶ Many scholars have mentioned the stylistic and artistic features of Solovyov’s works.¹⁴⁷ According to Lev Lopatin, a close friend of Solovyov, “many readers appreciated the high artistic quality of writing in his works”, and they thought that his ideas were just “an expression of the eccentricity of a very capricious, but large wit”.¹⁴⁸ Solovyov himself gave ground for calling himself a writer when he wrote about the “philosophical–literary agenda” of such a thinker as Plato.¹⁴⁹ Losev’s remark that

¹⁴⁶ Розанов В.В. Из “Мимолетного” // Владимир Соловьев: Pro et contra. Личность и творчество Владимира Соловьева в оценке русских мыслителей и исследователей. Антология – Издательство Русского Христианского института, 2000. – С.154. (Rozanov V. From *Mimoletnoye* // Vl. Solovyov: *Pro et contra. Personality and Works of Vladimir Solovyov in Works of Russian Thinkers and Researchers* – St. Petersburg: Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute Press, 2000).

¹⁴⁷ Zenkovsky writes: “The element of *publicistika* penetrates into all the different works, including the purely philosophical ones of Solovyov. His clear style, sharp notes, authentic pathos – all these reflect him as an outstanding author”. (Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., т. 2 – Л.: Эро, 1991. – С. 24 (Zenzovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.)) Nikolai Strakhov wrote Lev Tolstoi a controversial and subjective note emphasizing an important feature of Solovyov. Strakhov was very critical of Solovyov’s philosophy and vision, but he gives a ground for working on the stylistic devices of the texts of Solovyov: “I share your opinion about Solovyov; he denies Hegel openly, although he follows him secretly. All criticism of Schopenhauer is based on this. But the matter is, it appears, even worse. Being glad that he has found “*a metaphysical essence*”, Solovyov is ready to confront it everywhere and is prone to believe in *spiritism*. And he is very ill-looking – we can worry about – he will not finish well. But his book, the more I read it, the more it seems to me to be very talented. What skill in style, what linkage and power!” (Смирнов Марк, “Россию можно поздравить с гениальным человеком”. Материалы к биографии. // Логос. Диалог Восток–Запад, № 50 – Брюссель, Мюнхен, Москва: Логос-Диалог, 1995. – С. 288–298 (Smirnov M. *Russia can be Congratulated on a Genius* // *Logos. Russia West-East*)); Ernest Radlov’s note in his book (Радлов Э.Л. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творения – СПб., 1913. – С.129 (Radlov E. *Vladimir Solovyov. Life and Works*)) is also interesting: “It is better for a reader to get to know the features of the philosophy of Solovyov and his distinguished analysis, starting from *The Justification of the Good* where all different threads are knitted in an artistic whole”.

¹⁴⁸ Лопатин Л.М. Философские характеристики и речи. М.: Academia, 1995. – С. 112 – 113. (Lopatin L. *Philosophical Characteristics and Speeches*).

¹⁴⁹ Solovyov V. *Plato’s Life Drama* // Solovyov V. *Politics. Law, and Morality* /Edited and translated by V.Wozniuk/ – New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000. – p.215).

“Solovyov writes more popularly than ordinary academic professors” is also an important indication.¹⁵⁰

To regard a philosophical work of Solovyov as a literary text means to diverge from the tradition separating philosophy and literature, at least in Russian philosophy.¹⁵¹ I accept Todorov’s definition of literature “as a systematically organized language, and therefore concentrating attention on itself”,¹⁵² but defining (Russian) philosophy as “a systematically organized language” still sounds somewhat unusual for me. Moreover, it does not match the plans and purposes of Solovyov, who regarded himself searching for “absolute principles”, “absolute all-unifying spirit”, etc.; who posed questions like “what is the purpose of human existence?”; and dealt with “a free theosophy” using elements of “organic logic”, i.e. asking metaphysical questions having nothing to do with literary style.

The narrative approach that I offer here does not deny the philosophical and cultural significance of Solovyov’s works. This approach is appropriate when doxographical, historical, biographic, and purely philosophical interpretations have arrived at a kind of critical point, and a transition is needed to the next stage of case-studies, as researchers focus on the details of Solovyov’s life and works. The study of the major aspects of Solovyov’s philosophy and life is coming to the end. In its place is developing a new trend in academic writing about Solovyov is developing. It is addressed to students, graduates and everyone interested in Russian philosophy. Some examples of this trend are very interesting and worth mentioning.¹⁵³ There

¹⁵⁰ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 703 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*). He also noted that Solovyov’s theory about unification of churches “is not a theory but the fantastic romance and dream, if not simply a fairy tale or novel” (Ibid. p. 259)

¹⁵¹ From the point of view of Solovyov himself the self-definition as a writer could well be possible. So, when Lopatin or Rozanov call him “a writer” it sounds normal for the 19th century. Solovyov himself wrote about Kant as “such a purely cerebral philosopher and theoretical writer”. (Ibid. p.214)

¹⁵² Тодоров Ц. Понятие литературы // Семиотика — М.: Радуга, 1983. (Todorov T. *The Notion of Literature*). Another definition of literature by Todorov can be found in his book *Literature and Its Theories*: “Literature is a discourse that is sufficient into itself” (Todorov T. *Literature and Its Theories. A Personal View of the 20th Century Criticism* /Translated by C.Porter/ — London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988. — p. 4.)

¹⁵³ Корнилов С.В. Философия самосознания и творчества. Портреты русских мыслителей — СПб.: Изд-во С.Петербургского университета, 1998. — С. 223. (Kornilov S. *Philosophy of Self-knowledge and Creation. Portraits of Russian Thinkers*); Дидоренко С.А. Метафизика одного вседствия — М.:

are also attempts to compare Solovyov's philosophy with non-Russian philosophical traditions.¹⁵⁴

1.3. Advantages and Disadvantages of the Narrative Approach

The narrative interpretation is a valuable addition to the existing tradition of analysis of Solovyov and of Russian philosophy as a whole. The narrative methods of analysis have become traditional in literary studies in the 1960's; in the 1970's they established themselves and showed their advantages in different fields of the Humanities (philosophy, history, cultural studies). Because they developed in (and originated within) the sphere of literary studies, their application was limited to a single text. Generally speaking, narrative analysis follows the logic of a text, and for an analysis of several works of the same author or a group of authors one needs to apply the narrative methods very carefully, because of the individuality of every text.

The extension of application of narrative methods might be called the poetics of a particular group of texts or poetics of a particular author, but the problem is that the term "poetics" is associated with literary studies. That is why any text is considered partly to be a narrative text (if not, directly, a literary one), when applying any narrative (or literary studies) method to it. Turning to a concrete field of study, such as Solovyov studies or Russian philosophy as a whole, I will compare narrative methods with other methods used in Solovyoviana, or in the history of philosophy. Narrative methods have been already used, especially in the areas of history and art studies. In section 1.1, I have already mentioned works of Gossman, Shiner, White, Ankersmit, Jameson, and Marin, authors who analyze texts from the point of view of their narrative structures. The problem is not one of recognition, or of the legitimacy of narrative methods as an addition to existing methods and paradigms in the Humanities; it is a question of how effective these are, when they are the only, or predominant methods, used in a work.

Московский философский фонд, 1999. — С. 229 (Didorenko S. *The Metaphysics of an All-unity*); Столярова Т.Ф., Пантин В.И. Воспламененная душа. Вольные размышления о Владимире Соловьеве — М.: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2000. — С. 320 (Stolyarova T., Pantin V. *The Inflamed Soul*).

¹⁵⁴ Шохин В.К. В.С. Соловьев, индийская философия и проблемы компаративистики // Историко-философский ежегодник — М.: Мартис, 1996. — С. 91–121. (Shokhin V. V.Solovyov, *Indian Philosophy and the Problems of Comparativistics // History of Philosophy. Yearbook-95*).

In the case of an analysis of a literary work (a poem, verse, novel, or story), it is best to approach it with a set of different methods, applied according to the principle of “anything goes”. But in the case of Solovyov studies, we find a very long tradition of application of doxographical, biographical, philosophical, historical, theological, literary, and other methods, apart from deconstruction and narratology. At the same time, this field of studies connected to a certain personality is still relatively small, and it is possible to take the results of previous research into account. In my opinion, narrative analysis cannot generally be the only method applied to a problem in any sphere of the Humanities. It has a supplementary nature. But in the case of a study of some personality, where all or most of the secondary literature is accessible, the application of narratology as a supplementary method makes sense. In my dissertation, I apply narrative analysis as an addition to the long tradition of analysis of different texts of Solovyov, in order to find narrative and discursive mechanisms that have not yet been described with the help of other methods.

The narrative method that I apply here is aimed at outlining those elements of Solovyov’s philosophy that have not yet been described, namely, the role of narrative and discursive structures in his texts. This is a new thing in Solovyoviana, and even in the history of Russian philosophy as a whole it has not yet been applied. My analysis is certainly not the only way of dealing with academic philosophical texts from Russian philosophy, but it is viable as a supplementary method. Furthermore, it is also a good way of dealing with general narrative structures in the Russian (or any other national) philosophical tradition in general. I have just worked on *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* as a kind of basic text which started a new trend in Russian religious philosophy.

I claim the text of Solovyov to be a piece of philosophic literature with its own poetics, subjects, tropes, etc., i.e. as a product of fiction on the basis of events of the history of philosophy. History of philosophy, according to Hegel, is “itself philosophy”, and thus I am not departing very much from philosophy at all.

Another advantage of narrative analysis is that it gives an opportunity to look at how a text is composed, and the sort of narrative structure on which it is based. Narrative analysis of Russian philosophy has not yet been realized, as it has in Russian literature studies.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁵ See Boris Uspensky’s work Успенский Б.А. Поэтика композиции. Структура художественного текста и типология композиционных форм. – М.: Искусство, 1973. – С. 193 (Uspensky B. *Poetics of Composition. The Structure of*

The purpose of such thorough, detailed literary analysis of texts of Pushkin, Tolstoi, Dostoyevsky and others was, of course, the school program in which these authors were studied. Solovyov and other Russian philosophers were not represented there; they started to be studied only after 1988, when Solovyov's works were re-published in Russia. Right now one cannot seriously argue that Solovyov is not studied properly in Russian schools. His works can be studied anywhere as classics of philosophy. That is why an application of the narrative approach is not connected directly with the needs of Russian (or any other) schools, but with general scholarly interest in more profound knowledge of Solovyov's works.

There is another important aspect to the application of narrative method to Solovyov's philosophical works, namely as part of the movement of philosophy away from contemporary *publicistika* and public polemics in Russia. The next step is to establish itself as an indisputable classical tradition which is necessarily outside of any narrow ideological engagement, beyond "the creation of images" like that of Solovyov-the reactionary and religious obscurantist, Solovyov-the democrat, Solovyov-the *kulturolog*, Solovyov-the feminist, or Solovyov-the environmentalist, all of which depend on the trend which suits the latest fashion.¹⁵⁶

1.4. Reflections on the Method of this Work

At the end of this chapter, I want to add a self-reflective moment. Recent discussion of the history of philosophy and "developments in the philosophy of the history of philosophy" has led to many interesting conclusions. For my purpose I want to take into account certain aspects of this discussion, and evaluate my place with respect to the history of philosophy as a whole; for this I rely on a summary given in Evert van der Zweerde's book on Soviet philosophy.¹⁵⁷ From the standpoint of the history of philosophy, my narrative approach is rather reductionist, in the sense

the Artistic Text and Typology of Forms of Composition). Also see Lotman Y. *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (Translated from the Russian by Gail Lenhoff and Ronald Vroon) — Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977. — p. 300.

¹⁵⁶ This is the final remark of Khoruzhy's article, and I totally agree with him at this point. See: Хоружий С.С. Наследие Владимира Соловьева сто лет спустя // Журнал Московской патриархии, N 11 — М., 2000 — С. 84 (Khoruzhy S. *The Heritage of Vladimir Solovyov Hundred Years Later*).

¹⁵⁷ Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Historiography of Philosophy. Istorico-Filosofskaja Nauka* — Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997. — pp. 5–6.

that “content” becomes subject to “form”. This is because I am dealing mostly with an individual text, as I try to take into account results of its reception in Solovyov studies. However, my reductionism provides an opportunity to complete (or at least to diversify) the portrait of Solovyov studies.

To describe briefly my position and approach to the problem of the history of philosophy, I would like to refer to Martial Guérout’s dianoématique (dianoéma = doctrine) approach, which “can remain parallel to science as well as to aesthetics without ever risking being absorbed into them”.¹⁵⁸ Van der Zweerde calls it “an aestheticizing approach”.¹⁵⁹ So, I resolve my methodological problems connected with reductionism of the narrative approach, by giving up “the notion of truth as the essence of philosophy”.¹⁶⁰ What I answer is not the basic question: “is Solovyov’s conception of the crisis of European philosophy adequate?” but a group of supplementary questions: “what makes Solovyov’s text so attractive?”; “what can a reader find in his text?”; “what else can we see and learn from this text, apart from a critique of Western philosophy, positivism in particular, and strong and convincing argument?”; “what makes Solov-

¹⁵⁸ Guérout M. *The History of Philosophy As a Philosophical Problem // The Monist: an International Quarterly Journal of General Philosophical Inquiry*, vol. 53, N.4 – La Salle: Hegeler Institute, 1969. – p. 586. “The concept of dianoematic history as a discipline bearing on the conditions for the possibility of philosophies (dianoéma = doctrine) is unambiguously determined by this formula. It establishes that every philosophy proceeds from a truth of judgment bearing on the “real”, its nature and its transcendental location. In doing this, it decrees this “real” as a thing of spirit, sensible or intelligible, unity or plurality, being or freedom, immutability or becoming, etc. The restraint imposed by the scientific demand relative to this *true judgment on reality* leads to the intrinsic truth by the *positing of true reality*”. (Ibid. p. 586)

¹⁵⁹ Guérout writes at the end of his article: “Philosophies stand as monuments of thought having their own value, which is impervious to history; they are as much eternal objects for meditations as artistic monuments are eternal object for contemplation and emotion. Their paradoxical permanence does not lie in their representative truth, defined as *adaequatio rei et intellectus*; indeed on the contrary it is through it that they appear to be frail, contradicting one another, and running counter to the science of today and tomorrow. It is due to their intrinsic truth, that is, to the concept that they enclose something real (*sui generis*), born of their systematic and architectonic constructions. Now, what constitutes an immortal substance of all works of arts is precisely an intrinsic truth, *veritas in re*, which is heterogeneous with all truths and judgments”. (Ibid. p. 585)

¹⁶⁰ Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Historiography of Philosophy. Istorico-Filosofskaja Nauka* – Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997. – p. 6.

yov's argument interesting even for us?" etc. In Guérout's words, I analyze Solovyov's *The Crisis* as a monument of Russian thought having its own value.

Moreover, Solovyov's own concept of the history of philosophy is very close to a Hegelian one. I will analyze it in sections 2.1 and 2.4. Hegel's conception of the history of philosophy, the "lasting value" of which "consists in his attempt to understand philosophy itself as a part of history",¹⁶¹ is very important for an analysis of integral systems of knowledge like the one Solovyov created, because Solovyov tried to overcome Hegelianism and rationalism, operating in the Hegelian paradigm. With many philosophers after Hegel, he employed traditional philosophical concepts of unity and absolute truth in the attempt to create a unifying system of concepts. In this respect, he stayed within the philosophical mainstream of his time, which in turn opposed Hegelian universalism.

In Gracia's *Philosophy and Its History* there is a detailed critique of different philosophic and non-philosophic approaches to the history of philosophy, including a paragraph stating that "historians of philosophy that approach the history of philosophy as *literary critics* share an interest in looking at historical texts as literary productions in which literary form is fundamental, and content is purely a function of form".¹⁶² Gracia reveals the pro's and con's of the approach of the literary critics. His main reproach to the literary critic's approach is that "if used in isolation it also has some important shortcomings. One of the most obvious disadvantages of this approach is that the literary critic tends to isolate the work from its author and the context".¹⁶³ In the case of Solovyov, it is difficult to study his texts in isolation from his life and cultural environment; this is why I do not isolate them, and try to involve the remarks of other scholars, coming from other points of view.

¹⁶¹ Ibid. p.7.

¹⁶² Gracia J.J.E. *Philosophy and Its History. Issues in Philosophical Historiography* – Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. – p. 259.

¹⁶³ Ibid. p. 260. Another claim is that "although for the interpretation of the meaning and significance of some texts the literary form in which they are presented is most important, and for all texts it is a factor that should be taken into account, many texts in the history of philosophy are sufficiently straightforward and devoid of literary embellishments and complexities that it is possible to understand their main conceptual thrust without much knowledge of literary criticism. Plainly, many philosophers have not been primarily or even distantly concerned with literary style and form". (Ibid. p. 261) This is generally true, but regarding Solovyov and his works in particular, we cannot say that he did not concern himself with style, because he was a writer, and I have reported many remarks on how others valued Solovyov's style no less than his ideas.

Gracia recognizes that “indeed, the study of Plato without regard to the literary form that he used certainly will lead to interpretative disaster. Moreover, the same can be said about many other philosophers, like Nietzsche, who expressed themselves in complex literary genres”.¹⁶⁴ With respect to Solovyov, it must be said that he is a philosopher with a clear literary style, and a philosopher who used many genres from plays to mystical poetry and philosophy; and one of the main goals of my work is to highlight this very point. I am concerned to elaborate a framework for the narrative study of any text in Russian philosophy. However, taking into account the individuality of every philosophical text, some texts may allow for such a mode of analysis more than others. I do not intend to answer the question of why Solovyov presented an idea in a particular form, and expressed it by means a particular device. I doubt whether this question can ever be answered with certainty, but my investigation in any case elucidates the role of the formal – rhetorical and poetical – elements in his works.

1.5. Conclusions

Narrative analysis is considered to be a research strategy aimed at analysis of different forms of narratives, namely, the components of an author’s world-view (ideologies, theories, or social prejudices), unconscious elements such as the representation of space, time, and of forms of causality, narrative and discursive structures, narrative devices (tropes), codes, as well as the participants in events discussed in philosophical texts and the functions of these participants.¹⁶⁵ Such analysis answers the ques-

¹⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 260.

¹⁶⁵ A good picture of narratology (as a trend of analysis of textual structures) and its development within the limits and under the influence of structuralism and post-structuralism is given in Ilya Ilyin’s book: Ильин И.П. Постмодернизм от истоков до конца столетия – М.: Интрада, 1997. – С. 31–51 (Ilyin I. *Postmodernism from the Sources up to the End of the Century*). I must say that Ilya Ilyin follows and uses thoroughly the terms of the scholars he writes about, that his description is very thorough, and gives us a clear understanding of what sort of dissent is taking shape in the Humanities of the 20th century. In this context even the word “narratology” itself looks like a trend that can be described from a structuralist and post-structuralist points of view. So I try not to use the word “narratology” unless it is unavoidable, and will stay within the limits of narrative analysis, though not in Barthes’ manner; the latter does not seem to me to be appropriate for a dissertation, because it is very individual and non-academic. Barthes’ statements are often not well-grounded, and are based only on his intuition or vision of the texts.

tion “What is this text?” And this takes us back to the Formalists’ formula “How is a specific text composed?”

In light of this general problem of philosophical writing, I think that a better understanding of some brilliant works in philosophy (Russian philosophy in particular) is needed. The influence of these works cannot be attributed only to a novelty of ideas and re-arrangement of known ideas.¹⁶⁶ In my work I discuss and offer a solution to a problem which has not yet been addressed in Solovyoviana, namely the character of the artistic whole found in a book like *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*

After outlining the purposes of my work in Introduction, I discuss the perspectives which the application of narrative methods provides in section 1.1. In the next section I raise the question of the methodological basis of Solovyov studies, and explain the new approaches which are gradually being used in this area of study.

I discuss the advantages and disadvantages of narrative analysis in section 1.3. The fact that narrative analysis follows the logic of a text is one of its disadvantages, an obstacle to its universalization as a method; but if a scholar is deliberately limited to a separate text (as often happens in the tradition of case studies), there is an opportunity to find something new in the text, and in the author’s entire concept. The obvious disadvantage is emphasized by Gracia: the narrative researcher tends to isolate the text from its author and the context. As I work with Solovyoviana, a very familiar field of studies for me, I do try to avoid this isolation. Besides, Solovyov is a philosopher of such outstanding literary talent, that as we read the text, the inevitable isolation of the narrative is compensated by the results of close reading and the discoveries of new elements in the author’s argumentation and story.

¹⁶⁶ This is a starting-point of any research. “The method of social sciences, like that of the natural sciences, consists in trying out tentative solutions to certain problems: the problems from which our investigations start, and those which turns up during the investigation”. Popper K. *The Logic of the Social Sciences // The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology* – London: Heinemann, 1976. – p. 89.

CHAPTER 2. THE CRISIS OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY AS HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

2.1. Reception of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*

The Crisis of Western Philosophy by Solovyov is well known, both as a separate work and in the context of his collected works. It was translated into French (1947), Japanese (1982), and English (for the last time in 1996), so the text is known outside Russia as well.¹ There were many critical and positive responses to the dissertation in the Russian press in the 1870's by M. Vladislavlev, N. Strakhov, K. Kavelin, V. Lesevich, A. Kozlov, N. Mikhailovsky.² Yevgeny Trubetskoi has tried to argue that *The Crisis* had its roots in Schelling's philosophy.³ I would like to discuss commentaries of this text in major works (A. Kaelas, E. Radlov, S.M. Solovyov, K. Mochulsky,

¹ Soloviev V. *Crise de la philosophie occidentale* (trad. Herman) – Paris: Aubier, 1947. – p. 381. Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* /Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 149. I found an account of the Japanese edition of *The Crisis* in Sutton J. *The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov. Towards a Reassessment.* – London: Macmillan Press, 1988. – p. 230.

² Владиславлев М. И. Кризис западной философии против позитивистов, Владимира Соловьева // Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения – СПб., 1875, январь. – С. 247 – 271. (Vladislavlev M. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy Against Positivists*, by Vladimir Solovyov // *Journal of the Ministry of Education*, 1875) Страхов Н.Н. Философский диспут 24 ноября – Гражданин, 3 декабря, № 48 – М., 1874 – С. 1211–1212; (Strakhov N. *The Philosophical Debate of the 24th of November* // *Grazhdanin* 3rd of Dec. 1874, № 48). Его же: Еще о диспуте Соловьева – Московские ведомости, 9 декабря, 1874; (Strakhov N. *Once More on the Debate of Solovyov*); Кавелин К. Д. Априорная философия или положительная наука? По поводу диссертации г. В. Соловьева. – СПб.: Типография М. Стасюлевича, 1875. – С. 1–48 (Kavelin K. *Philosophy a priori or Positive Science? On the Dissertation of V. Solovyov*); Лесевич В.В. Как иногда пишутся диссертации. // Отечественные записки – 1875. (Lesevich V. *How Dissertations are Written Sometimes?*); Козлов А.А. Влад. Соловьев как философ – Знание, 1875, январь. – С. 1–18 (Kozlov A. *Vlad. Solovyov as a Philosopher*); Михайловский Н.К. О диспуте г-на В. Соловьева – Биржевые ведомости, 27 ноября, 1874 (Mikhailovsky N. *On the Dispute of V. Solovyov*).

³ Трубецкой Е.Н. Мирозерцание Владимира Соловьева, в 2-х т., Т. 1 – М., 1913. – С.50 – 58 (Trubetskoi E. *Vladimir Solovyov's World-view* in 2 vols., vol. 1).

V.Spirov, A. Walicki, A. Losev, *Russian Philosophy. Dictionary*⁴) and draw some conclusions from this detailed reception of Solovyov's first major work.

The Crisis marked a renaissance of interest in theoretical metaphysics and (to some extent) religious philosophy in Russian public opinion. All scholars agree on this. Until the public debate of Solovyov, the metaphysical trend in Russian academic philosophy was overshadowed by positivism, empiricism, materialism, and socialism.⁵ Leading academic philosophers were concerned with classical philosophy (Pamfil Yurkevich, Mikhail Vladislavlev), empiricism (Matvei Troitsky), history of philosophy (Boris Chicherin), or theology and philosophy of religion (Viktor Kudryavtsev, Yurkevich). The time for a philosophical system had not come yet, accord-

⁴ Каэлас А. Владимир Соловьев как философ и моралист — Калуга, 1908. — С. 4 (Kaelas A. *Vladimir Solovyov as a Philosopher and Moralist*); Радлов Э.Л. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творения — СПб., 1913. — С.12. (Radlov E. *Vladimir Solovyov. Life and Works*); Спилов В.В. Философия истории Вл. Соловьева в ее развитии и преемственности /Исторические судьбы одной теократической утопии/: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук — М.: МГУ, 1969. — С.26–35. (Spirov V. *Vl.Solovyov's Philosophy of History in its' Development and Receptivity /Historical Fate of a Theocratic Utopia / PhD dissertation*); Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция — М.: Республика, 1997. — С.75–78. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*); Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский — М.: Республика, 1995. — С. 85–95. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*); Kline G.L. *Hegel and Solovyov // Hegel and the History of Philosophy. Proceedings of the 1972 Hegel Society in America Conference* /edited by J. O'Malley and others/ — Martinus Nijhoff: The Hague, 1974. — 161–163 pp; Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* — Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989. — pp. 560–563. This work presents a very clear conclusion on how the philosophy of Ivan Kireevsky affected Solovyov in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*: “Solovyov adopted Kireevsky's philosophical ideas but tore them from the total context of Slavophilic doctrine and by doing so set them up as an autonomous philosophical theory” (p.563); Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 135–137 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*); Межуев Б.В. “Кризис западной философии” // Русская философия. Словарь — М.: Республика, 1995. — С. 243 – 245. (Mezhuyev B. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy // Russian Philosophy. Dictionary*); *La Crise de la Philosophie Occidentale* // Herman M. *Vie et uvre de Vladimir Soloviev. Essai* — Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1995. — pp. 23–29.

⁵ See Kornblatt J.D. *Russian Religious Thought and the Jewish Kabbala // The Occult in Russian and Soviet Culture*. /Edited by Bernice Rosenthal/ — Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1997. — p. 76.

ing to Zenkovsky: “Russian thought has been *on the threshold* of systems for a long time. Chernyshevsky, Lavrov, Mikhailovsky, and Strakhov did not create a real system. The reason of this is not lack of talent, but that their philosophic talents “were dispersed”, i.e. were concerned with the concrete life and topics of the day. How much philosophical reflection and real philosophical work went into *publicistika*, for example!”⁶ Nikolai Lossky called the philosophers who worked in the 1860’s – 1870’s “the predecessors of Solovyov” (Yurkevich, Kudryavtsev, Nikolai Fyodorov),⁷ although, he probably meant that they worked on the same or similar themes as Solovyov, who was the first to take on “the task of an organic synthesis”.⁸ There were other predecessors of Solovyov that could be called “predecessors of Solovyov’s vision” from the Slavophile group of thinkers and writers: Khomyakov, I.Kireyevsky, Ivan Aksakov and Yuri Samarin. To some extent, even the later Slavophiles, Nikolai Danilevsky and Konstantin Leont’ev, could be called “the predecessors of Solovyov”. But, in comparison with him, they stayed within the limits of Slavophilism as they tried to develop it, and they took a different route. Solovyov had the same synthesizing and unifying role for Russian philosophy as Pushkin did for Russian literature 50 years earlier.⁹

With his *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* Solovyov became the first to offer a short, concise, and academic interpretation of the development of philosophy in Europe. This he combined with a critical attitude (like that of Slavophiles Khomyakov and Ivan Kireevsky) towards Western philosophy and European culture. He was looking for a turn to synthetic religious

⁶ Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., Т. 2, ч.1 – Л.: Эго, 1991. – С. 7 (Zenkovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.).

⁷ Лосский Н.О. История русской философии – М.: Советский писатель, 1991. – С. 82–91.

⁸ Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., Т. 2, ч. 1 – Л.: Эго, 1991. – С. 7 (Zenkovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.).

⁹ In the first edition of his *Philosophical Characterizations and Speeches* (1911), Lev Lopatin emphasized this “Pushkin-like role” of Solovyov in Russian philosophy, but he put it in a slightly different manner: “Solovyov was the first really original Russian thinker, like Pushkin was the first Russian people’s poet”. (Лопатин Л.М. Философские характеристики и речи – М.: Academia, 1995. – С.112. (Lopatin L. *Philosophical Characterizations and Speeches*)). Andrzej Walicki starts his article on Solovyov with the statement that “his significance for Russian philosophy is often compared to the significance of Alexandr Pushkin for Russian poetry”. (Walicki A. *Solov’ev, Vladimir Sergeevich (1853–1900)* // *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* /General Editor E.Craig/, in 10 vols., vol. 9 – London: Routledge, 1998. – p.29).

philosophy, as an alternative to secularization.¹⁰ This was a creative, new element in the attitude towards the cultural heritage of his Slavophile predecessors. Solovyov spoke about Western philosophy as a process in which he perceived a cyclical return to religious philosophy, while the Slavophiles criticized the West only for its refusal of religious vision.¹¹

Solovyov exaggerated and overestimated his conclusions regarding von Hartmann's philosophy, where he found "the same truths that have been affirmed in the form of faith and spiritual contemplation by the great theological teachers of the East (in part the ancient East and especially Christian East)".¹² Solovyov valued von Hartmann's philosophy as the latest achievement in German thought and wanted to see von Hartmann in Berlin, on the way to London in 1875.¹³ His contemporary opponents (notably M.Vladislavlev, K.Kavelin, and N.Strakhov) criticized him se-

¹⁰ Zenkovsky has discussed this attitude of Russians towards European thought in his work *Russian Thinkers and Europe. A Critique of European Culture by Russian Thinkers* // Zenkovsky V. *Russian Thinkers and Europe* (Зеньковский В.В. Русские мыслители и Европа. Критика европейской культуры у русских мыслителей // Зеньковский В.В. Русские мыслители и Европа — М.: Республика, 1997. — С. 37–51.).

¹¹ Lopatin, a close friend of Solovyov, did not change his attitude towards Solovyov's first major work. Forty years after the *The Crisis* was published he wrote: "Vl. Solovyov about forty years ago in his first major work pointed out that the moment of a great crisis had come to European Philosophy, that its major trends have been discussed to the point of a final conclusion, its unsolved inner problems have been faced and that some features of a new philosophical world-view has taken clear shape, one that would provide Western Philosophy with a way out of its status of inner disintegration. This optimistic prophecy of Solovyov has not yet come true". (Лопатин Л.М. Настоящее и будущее философии // Философские характеристики и речи — М.: Academia, 1995. — С. 81. (Lopatin L. *The Present and the Past of Philosophy* // *Philosophic Characterizations and Speeches*).

¹² Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ — Esalen Institut/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. — p. 149. In the Russian version, I used the edition Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 5–138.

¹³ Киейзик Л. Владимир Соловьев и польский вопрос // Соловьевский сборник. Материалы международной конференции "В.С. Соловьев и его философское наследие" 28–30 августа 2000 /под редакцией И.В. Борисовой, А.П. Козырева/ — М.: Философия-Герменевтика, 2001. — С. 488. (Kieyzik L. *Vladimir Solovyov and the Polish Problem* // *Solovyov Collection. Selected Papers of the International Conference "Vladimir Solovyov and his Philosophical Heritage" held in Moscow, August 28–30.* /Edited by I. Borisova, A. Kozyrev/).

verely for this overestimation of von Hartmann.¹⁴ Surely, they emphasized, the author of the dissertation offered great perspectives, especially when he stated the “necessity of more elevated thought” and of “a universal synthesis of science, philosophy and religion” that would lead to “the resurrection of the perfect inner unity of the world of thought”.¹⁵ It is well known that Solovyov planned the removal of the “one-sidedness”.¹⁶ It was his central metaphor for the characterization of any existing way of thinking and trend in philosophy. Here he follows Hegel’s conception of history of philosophy sharing the “apparent immodesty” of Hegel’s philosophical system, which is situated “at the end of the philosophical development of philosophy as its result, totalizing all previous development”.¹⁷ He believed that until this so-called “synthesis” (“a complete and universal

¹⁴ Кавелин К.Д. Априорная философия или положительная наука? По поводу диссертации г. В. Соловьева — СПб., 1875. — С. 40 (Kavelin K. *Philosophy a priori or Positive Science? On the dissertation of Mr. V.Solovyov*); A survey of this critique can be found in: Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время. — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 31 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

¹⁵ Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., Т. 2, ч.1 — Л.: Эро, 1991. — С. 26 (Zenkovsky V.I. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.)).

¹⁶ It is a Hegelian conception in the sense that it criticizes the one-sidedness of previous philosophical systems. “According to Hegel, the history of philosophy is the gradual coming about, in and through time, of philosophical truth, realized in each subsequent epoch, by the last, fullest, and most concrete philosophical system of the epoch. This system absorbs — “sublates” — all previous philosophical systems as one-sided answers to major philosophical problems, and includes the fundamental principles of those philosophies as moments in the system of philosophy”. (Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Historiography of Philosophy. Istoriko-Filosofskaja Nauka* — Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1997. — p. 5.) Yevgeny Trubetskoi claimed that Solovyov “was a relentless expositor of any one-sidedness and a shrewd critic: in every human opinion he always discerned a sign of the conditional and the relative”. (Трубецкой Е.Н. Мирозерцание Владимира Соловьева, в 2-х т., Т. 1 — М.: Медиум, 1995. — С. 25 (Trubetskoi E. *Vladimir Solovyov’s World-View*, in 2 vols., vol. 1)).

¹⁷ Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Historiography of Philosophy. Istoriko-Filosofskaja Nauka* — Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1997. — p. 9. Solovyov proclaims a coming unity of the intellectual world, and it is similar to Hegel’s “claim that a single logic, viz. the logic of the Idea, is at work both in the system of philosophy and in the historical sequence of philosophies”. (Ibid.) Instead of the Hegelian Idea, Solovyov posited the concept of “synthesis” as the basic perspective of his narrative on the history of philosophy in *The Crisis*. Solovyov shares the Hegelian idea of putting “an end to the very history of philosophy”. (Ibid. p. 10). According to Solovyov, philosophy should be replaced by “Integral Knowledge” or “universal synthesis”, i.e. something which is already not philosophy proper.

resolution of those questions, which were resolved one-sidedly”, i.e. “the realization of this universal synthesis of science, philosophy, and religion”¹⁸) on which he was working would come true, “*the unity of the intellectual world*”¹⁹ would not be achieved.²⁰ The project of unity, or integral knowledge, was already presented by the Slavophiles, particularly Ivan Kireyevsky, who died in 1856.²¹ Followers and talented successors like Nikolai Danilevsky and Konstantin Leont’ev had not yet left the public stage when Solovyov entered it.²² According to Lev Lopatin, a witness of

¹⁸ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – pp. 12, 149. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 5, 122)

¹⁹ This is a rather traditional claim of authors of histories of philosophy, starting from Georg Horn’s book *Historiae Philosophicae* (Leiden, 1655), which was “the first general history of philosophy” and in which the author speaks about “the original unity of thought” (Passmore J. *Philosophy, Historiography of // The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* /Edited by Edwards P./, in 8 vols., vol. 6 – London: The Macmillan Company, 1967. – p. 227). In comparison with Horn, Solovyov actually talks about the coming unity of the intellectual world, thus giving an original shift in the problem of intellectual unity.

²⁰ At this point, Solovyov also depends on Hegel’s conception of the history of philosophy, because Solovyov is also looking for something eternal and everlasting which has also to be a result of world development. Hegel put his philosophical system “at the end of the historical development of philosophy as its result,” so he “put an end to the very history of philosophy”. (Zweerde E. *avn der Soviet Historiography of Philosophy. Istoriko-Filosofskaja Nauka* – Dordrecht/Boston/ London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997. – pp. 9–10) Solovyov made a similar step in his narration about history of philosophy. He proclaimed an end to the development of philosophy; the final result which has still to come is “the unity of the intellectual world”. I discuss Solovyov’s approach to history of philosophy in section 2.4.

²¹ For details see Herman M. *Vie et uvre de Vladimir Soloviev. Essai* – Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1995. – 26–27 pp.; *Ivan Kireevsky and Integral Knowledge, The Idea of Integral Knowledge* // Copleston F. *Philosophy in Russia. From Herzen to Lenin and Berdyaev* – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986. – pp. 64–68. *The Slavophiles* // Walicki A. *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism* /Translated from the Polish by H.Andrews-Rusiecka/ – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980. – pp. 92–114; Serbinenko V. *Slavophilism // A History of Russian Philosophy. From the Tenth Through the Twentieth Centuries*, in 2 vols., vol. 2 /Edited by Valery Kuvakin/– Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1994. – pp. 146–151.

²² Andreyeva L. *Nikolai Danilevsky; Konstantin Leontyev // A History of Russian Philosophy. From the Tenth Through the Twentieth Centuries*, in 2 vols., vol. 2 /Edited by Valery Kuvakin/ – Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1994. – pp. 399–421.

the spiritual atmosphere of the 1870's, "their attitude towards philosophy was negative rather than positive; in their philosophic view they were limited by a negative critique of German idealism, notably of Hegel and his system, and they clearly proclaimed the complete bankruptcy of all speculative philosophy if it is not based on positive religious belief".²³

Solovyov's dispute was not the first serious work of a Russian philosopher against positivism,²⁴ but it marked the beginning of criticism of existing (and even developing) philosophical systems like positivism, i.e. the beginning of a critical attitude towards current trends in philosophy. To some extent, Solovyov's dissertation was also a critique of that Slavophilism which rejected Western rationalism, and spoke of some integral knowledge outside Western rationalism. By contrast, Solovyov was trying to seek a synthesis, or at least signs of a coming synthesis within Western philosophy. His dissertation discovered in Western philosophy "certain synthetic tendencies and attempts at building up a more or less integral philosophy of spirit".²⁵

The main topic of dispute was the question of the extent of the author's dependence on Western and Slavophile theories, and in this respect the most interesting observation belongs to Y.Trubetskoi: "Following Ivan Kireyevsky and Aleksei Khomyakov, the author (Solovyov) overcame the *rational* elements of West-European philosophy relatively easily, but he underestimated the much more subtle temptation of its different mystic and religious combinations of ideas; he especially could never clearly keep his distance from Schelling's gnosticism".²⁶ A modern author writes about the significance of *The Crisis* for Solovyov himself: "The main idea of the work – the religious vocation of philosophy and culture – will be a leading motif of his works".²⁷

²³ Лопатин Л.М. Философские характеристики и речи – М.: Academia, 1995. – С. 108. (Lopatin L. *Philosophic Characterizations and Speeches*).

²⁴ Lev Lopatin states that V.Tsinger's speech *Exact Science and Positivism* delivered in January 1874 at Moscow University and published in the university report was a big public event. Ibid. p. 310.

²⁵ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 135–136 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

²⁶ Трубецкой Е.Н. Мирозерцание Владимира Соловьева, в 2-х т., т. 1. М: Медиум, 1995. – С. 67. (Trubetskoi E. *Vladimir Solovyov's World-view*, in 2 vols.)

²⁷ Межуев Б.В. "Кризис западной философии" // Русская философия. Словарь – М.: Республика, 1995. – С. 245. (Mezhuyev B. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* // *A Dictionary of Russian Philosophy*).

The latest, and the most extensive descriptions of *The Crisis* in secondary literature on Solovyov can be found in Andrzej Walicki's *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism* and Nelly Motroshilova's *Vladimir Solovyov and the Search of New Paradigms in Western Philosophy*.²⁸ They describe only the main ideas of the work.²⁹

I refer to Walicki's work and this quotation in particular because it illustrates that "the level of narrative" or the level of ideas in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* has been analyzed, and a clear conclusion has been articulated. We can find similar argumentation linking Hegel, Schelling, the Slavophiles and Dostoyevsky as sources for Solovyov's critique in works of the authors from Solovyov's contemporary opponents and Y.Tru-

²⁸ Walicki A. *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism* /Translated from the Polish by H.Andrews-Rusiecka/ – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980. – pp. 375–376. Nelly Motroshilova analyzes *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* in her article *Vladimir Solovyov and the Search of New Paradigms in Western Philosophy in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century* (Мотрошилова Н.В. Владимир Соловьев и поиски новых парадигм в западной философии последней четверти XIX-го века // Соловьевский сборник. Материалы международной конференции "В.С. Соловьев и его философское наследие" 28 – 30 августа 2000 /под редакцией И.В. Борисовой, А.П. Козырева/ – М.: Философия-Герменевтика, 2001. – С. 515. (*Solovyov Collection. Selected Papers of the International Conference "Vladimir Solovyov and his Philosophical Heritage" held in Moscow, August 28 – 30.* /Edited by I. Borisova, A. Kozyrev/) – С. 258–262). Motroshilova focuses on innovative aspects of Solovyov's critique of Western philosophy, namely his "general typology of the world-views taken in their inner problematical connection".(Ibid. p. 261) She emphasizes that Solovyov developed a "dramatic typological and historical philosophy of the crisis" (Ibid. p. 262). In Tatyana Kochetkova's *Vladimir Solovyov's Theory of Divine Humanity*: PhD dissertation – Kiev: Blago, 2001, defended at the Catholic University of Nijmegen in 2002 there is an extensive discussion of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* linked to Solovyov's basic concepts such as Divine Humanity.

²⁹ Walicki's major points are: "Solovyov defines the crisis of Western European Philosophy as a crisis of rationalism – of all abstract and purely theoretical knowledge The pluralism of philosophical systems was a product of the dissolution of primitive unity, the result of alienation and the self-affirmation of the individual Ego. Western philosophy was born of the conflict of individual reason and faith... Within this Slavophile framework, Solovyov advanced several notions of his own concerning nodal points in the dialectic of European thought and devoted considerable attention to a number of systems, including those of Schopenhauer and Eduard von Hartmann. Ascribing to von Hartmann his own ideas, Solovyov proclaimed that the annihilation of the egoistic self-affirmation of warring individuals would be followed not by the Buddhist Nirvana but by the *apokatastasis ton panton*, the "kingdom of spirits bound together by the universality of the absolute spirit". (Ibid.)

betskoi up to modern authors. I do not need to revise the tradition started by Solovyov's opponents, developed by Losev and Valentin Asmus,³⁰ and represented at the moment by Walicki, Mezhuyev, Motroshilova and Kochetkova. All of them share the same comparativist approach and search parallels between Solovyov and European or Russian philosophers. I accept this tradition and work on another aspect, while taking into the latest conclusions of the tradition.

It is understandable that research on Solovyov's works has focused on the initial and final pages of *The Crisis*. Here Solovyov states his basic position on "the crisis of Western philosophy", the end of the "abstract-philosophical development", and the difference between his own and the positivists' views. At the end of *The Crisis*, the author outlines "the results of the whole of Western philosophical development" and proclaims his view of "the realization of this universal synthesis of science, philosophy, and religion".³¹ These ideas became basic for further development of Solovyov's views into a first Russian philosophical system. Studies of Mochulsky, Walicki, and Mezhuyev, all of whom have written surveys of *The Crisis*, regard the content of this book, conveying these basic ideas, to be the basis for Solovyov's conclusions. They did not touch on the subject of form and the role of formal elements (tropes) in *The Crisis* and Solovyov's conception. In this work I am doing exactly the opposite and raising the question of the form in *The Crisis*. Within the limits of a small chapter on *The Crisis* in Mochulsky's book or Mezhuyev's short article in a dictionary it was not possible; so they had to rely on Solovyov's own analysis of European philosophy. Certainly, Solovyov grounded his analysis and conclusions on the facts of the history of philosophy, and specific concrete philosophical texts. Because these facts of the history of philosophy and texts are (and were at Solovyov's time) quite well known, nobody analyzed what Solovyov actually wrote between the introduction and his famous conclusions very seriously. That is why this very influential work, the first volume of his *Collection of Works*, and the first in several popular editions of Solovyov's works, has not been analyzed from the point of view of the

³⁰ Асмус В.Ф. Владимир Соловьев — М.: Прогресс, 1994. — С. 206. (Asmus V. *Vladimir Solovyov*).

³¹ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ — Esalen Institute, Lindisfarne Press, 1996. — p. 149 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С.122).

logic and literary style of the author.³² The analysis of the content of ideas is not sufficient to account for the significant role played by books like *The Crisis* in Russian philosophical culture. Generally speaking, Solovyov's influence on the reader is connected to some suggestive and artistic elements of *The Crisis*, and I focus on them in this chapter.

From the imaginative point of view of Russian Formalism, the content of this work and the central ideas of *The Crisis* have been described many times, starting from the 20-page description by Alexandr Nikolsky in 1902,³³ and finishing with Mezhuiev's latest article in *A Dictionary of Russian Philosophy*.³⁴ Typically, this line of research values the text of *The Crisis* as a description of the development of European philosophy at the beginning of the 1870s, as Russian philosophy overcame the narrowness of the Slavophile approach. In this respect, it continues the philosophic tradition set up, partly, by Solovyov himself. This is not bad, of course, and it shows Solovyov's influence; but this implies a necessity of interpreting uncritically (if not simply sharing) some of his postulates, such as those on the crisis of Western philosophy itself, the necessity of the "whole view" of philosophy, the "synthesis of philosophy, science and religion", etc. Certainly, this will predetermine the final conclusion, and such research will "insert" *The Crisis* in the context of Solovyov's works as an initial step towards the philosophy of All-unity; moreover, the author himself clearly points to "the unity of the intellectual world" in the last lines of the book.³⁵ Accepting this precondition of "unity", we automatically depart from a modern pluralistic model of the world, and enter the monistic paradigm of Russian classical philosophy, which means that we also have to share some of its postulates. In this case even Solovyov's

³² I was led by my own subjective reason to look carefully at the textual structures which impressed me, when I started my acquaintance with this part of Russian philosophy, when it became available in the Soviet Union.

³³ Никольский А. Русский Ориген XIX века Вл.С.Соловьев – СПб.: Наука, 2000. – С.34–50. (Nikolsky A. *Russian Origen of the 19th Century Vladimir Solovyov*) In 1902, Nikolsky's description took 20 pages in Вера и Разум, № 10 – Харьков, 1902. – С. 443–462 (*Faith and Reason*).

³⁴ Межуев Б.В. "Кризис западной философии" // Русская философия. Словарь – М.: Республика, 1995. – С. 243 – 245. (Mezhuyev B. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy // A Dictionary of Russian Philosophy*).

³⁵ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – pp. 149 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 122).

conclusion about the “lack of unity” in the Western intellectual world (an important metaphor of *The Crisis*) receives a negative connotation. Even one of the latest Russian publications on the problem still underlines it as a negative state of affairs³⁶, sharing the famous prejudice and opposition of “Westernism-Slavophilism” and, according to Sergei Khoruzhy, thus remaining “within the framework of the usual opposition: Russia – the West, the Original – the Borrowed”.³⁷

I would like to get away from these preconditions, and treat *The Crisis* as a text which, like any philosophic, historiographical or literary text, belongs to intellectual history, and is the outcome of human thought. This removes the text of *The Crisis* from the tradition of Russian philosophy. The subject of my research is the process of the author’s work as it is represented in the final version, the mechanisms by which he generated of the text, and its structure. This approach differs from traditional research strategies already applied to Solovyov’s works, such as “the clarification of philosophic conceptions”, analysis of main ideas and conclusions of the author etc. It gives me the opportunity of studying history of philosophy (given in a well known text like *The Crisis*, or in fact in any other text) from the point of view of how this history is represented in the text, how the author structures its conception, the role of his experience (or inexperience) as a writer, and the role of tropes, and language skills.

This approach not only allows me to offer one more interpretation of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, but also to discover the process of production of meaning in a philosophical text, and forms of their changes. This allows for a new understanding of the content of *The Crisis*, its role and place in the philosophical tradition of the 19th century. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, more than any other text of Solovyov, contains direct and indirect quotations (the result of the author’s intention to realize the “objectivity” of a dissertation), intertextual elements and unintentional imitations. As a rule, research on Russian philosophy, finding many historical and philosophical remarks in *The Crisis*, preferred not to delve into the narrative material. They limited themselves, mostly, to the first and the last two or three pages, where the main ideas are represented clearly, i.e. the author’s voice is clear; this is obvious in Konstantin Mochulsky’s work,

³⁶ Потапенко М. И. Эстетичность основных философских идей Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М.: МГУ, 1997. – С. 23 (Potapenko M. *The Aesthetic Quality of Vladimir Solovyov’s Main Ideas*; PhD Dissertation).

³⁷ Хоружий С.С. О старом и новом – СПб.: Алетейя, 2000. – С. 9. (Khoruzhy S. *On the Old and the New*).

for example.³⁸ My task is to trace the combination of the author's world view with the views of his characters in the space of the text; I also want to examine the interaction of his view with numerous prejudices of the philosophic, scientific, and everyday mind, and the forms of the narrative and literary tradition of the time when the text was written. I am trying to answer the question "What is this text like?" rather than the question "What is Solovyov trying to tell us?" or "Is he right?"

2.2. Topic and Composition of the Text³⁹

I will start from the content of the text and will gradually go deeper into its structure. In this manner, I follow the logic of Solovyov's narrative; accordingly, I will analyse major elements of the structure of the text first, and then proceed to minor elements, like tropes and stylistic devices. That is why the parts of this chapter are related to each other in the same way that more obvious and fundamental elements of a textual structure are related to the elements that need to be deciphered and revealed.⁴⁰

³⁸ Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М.: Республика, 1995. – С. 88. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*).

³⁹ I use here the traditional definition (which can be taken from any dictionary of poetics) of composition as "a system of combination of signs and elements of a work of literature". It is based on the article of L.Nire *On the Meaning of the Composition* (Нире Л. О значении и композиции произведения // Семиотика и художественное творчество – М.: Наука, 1977. – С. 150). Yury Lotman in the book *The Structure of the Artistic Text (Michigan Slavic Contribution; no 7)* – Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977. – p. 279, defines composition: "the composition of an artistic text is structured as a sequence of functionally heterogeneous elements, a sequence of structural dominants on various levels". We can see that the definitions are quite similar.

⁴⁰ I follow the logic of the process of interpretation described in Umberto Eco's *The Role of the Reader. Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* – Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press, 1979. – p. 14. The diagram which "reflects the real steps empirically made by the interpreter" shows that there are higher and the lower levels of the text "interconnected in a continuous coming and doing". (Ibid. p.15) The process of interpretation starts from the highest levels of "Elementary ideological structures" (the level of the content or the level of ideas) and goes via "Actantial structures" and "Narrative structures" to "Discursive structures". In my analysis I follow the same sequence of steps, although, as Eco mentions, all these levels are interconnected, and there is an opportunity to swap some steps, if necessary. This happens, for example, it happened with *Forms of Representation of History*. In Solovyov's text the logic of the history of philosophy is connected with codes (i.e. types of narration) and modes of argumentation, and I have found that these should be introduced as a last step, because History and the Historical are not decisive components of a philosophical narrative.

The presence of numerous quotations, characters, and traces of their activity (presence) creates a dramatic tension. These quotations represent the main ideas of the characters, the author's interpretations of their teachings, and his comments. The only problem is that the author sometimes does not make a clear distinction between the thoughts of his characters and his own, a kind of vagueness we come across in the Introduction several times.⁴¹ In comparison with other works, like *The Justification of the Good* which also contains many quotations, but is a very big volume, where one can find series of quotations in numerous places, but not everywhere, *The Crisis* represents a typical process of European philosophy with respect to the controversies and disputes of the characters among each other.

From a formal point of view *The Crisis* is made up of five chapters embraced by an Introduction (*The Development of Western Philosophy from Scholasticism to Kant*) and an Appendix (*August Comte's Theory of the Three Phases in the Intellectual Development of Humankind*). It thus has a classical dramatic structure, and this will become clearer as I describe events in the successive sections.

The Introduction is in fact a Prologue, i.e. giving words from the author to introduce the reader to the situation in the past. The intriguing point is that the author implies that he writes from the point of view of a non-theoretical and non-abstract philosopher, because he states that "this book is based on the conviction that philosophy in the sense of an abstract, exclusively theoretical knowledge has ended its development and passed irretrievably into the world of the past".⁴² The Exposition is a synopsis of the main principles of different philosophic trends in Europe (philosophy for Solovyov is Eurocentric); it represents and outlines the characters that are shown later on stage.

The first chapter – the Opening – describes the post-Kantian stage of philosophy where the Ghost of the *Ding an sich*, as Solovyov interprets it: "The inner essence of the world", appears from time to time, reminding philosophers that it is impossible to know an "essence". At the end it

⁴¹ For example, in the reflection on the thoughts of John Scotus Erigena and his idea of reconciliation of reason and authority, we know from the author's remark afterwards that "the words cited above belong" to Erigena (Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* /Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute, Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – pp. 14–15 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 9–10)).

⁴² Ibid. p. 11. (Там же. С.5).

disappears, after noting that “the whole world of representation, both consequently perceived and abstractly thought, manifests itself as one whole, with one general character”.⁴³

In chapter 2, the systems of two late representatives of modern European philosophy are described. This chapter underlines the crisis-like nature of this period of development in the 19th century, and the search for ways out of this crisis presented by two “giants”, Arthur Schopenhauer and Eduard von Hartmann. Of course, the latter is emphasized because he is nearer in time. But his role as counterpart to Schopenhauer is emphasized also when the Ghost of the *Ding an sich* appears frequently and disappears totally after “the unconscious” (*Das Unbewusste*) of von Hartmann enters the stage.

In chapter 3, the author illustrates the “one-sidedness” and “formal limitedness” (generally speaking, these are the central metaphors of the *Crisis* in philosophy) of the latest Western philosophies just mentioned. The author thus comes to the core of the problem, and the main problem of the drama must soon be solved.

In chapter 4, which can be called the culmination, the author gives one more description of the crisis with a declaration of an optimistic finale in a sense that “the worse now, the better for the future”.⁴⁴

⁴³ Ibid. p. 69. (Там же. С.55).

⁴⁴ Actually, this strange logic was quite typical for Solovyov in this period. This became clear from the *Memoirs* of I.Yanzhul who tells the stories how Solovyov in 1875 in London (only a few months after the presentation of his dissertation) assessed the death of several workers in St.Peterburg with the words “The worse, the better,” and in his turn told a popular Russian legend about *Christ* who says “The worse the situation for this man here in this world, the more will return to him, hundredfold, in Heaven”. (Янжул И.И. Из воспоминаний о Вл. С. Соловьеве // Владимир Соловьев: Pro et contra. Личность и творчество Владимира Соловьева в оценке русских мыслителей и исследователей. Антология — СПб.: Изд-во Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 2000 — С. 101–102 (I.Yanzhul *From Memoirs on Vl. Solovyov* // *Vladimir Solovyov: Pro et Contra. Personality and Works of Vladimir Solovyov in Works of Russian Thinkers and Researchers* — St. Petersburg : Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute Press, 2000. — pp. 101–102)) We can find the same strange logic in Solovyov’s letter to Ekaterina Selevina: “Maybe it is even better that this external life has become so depressing, because we can apply the wise saying to this life: *the worse, the better*. Gladness and joy are dangerous, because they are illusory; grief and misfortune are often the only salvation”. (Соловьев В.С. Письма (под ред. Э.Л.Радлова) в 4-х т., Т. 3 — СПб.: Общественная польза, 1908–1923. — С. 58 (Solovyov V. *Letters* in 4 vols.)).

And finally, in chapter 5, the solution, a positive result is found in von Hartmann's "philosophy of superconscious". Especially after its "obvious absurdities" have been removed by the author, "here it turns out that these ultimate necessary results of the Western philosophical development affirm, in the form of rational knowledge, the same truths that have been affirmed in the form of faith and spiritual contemplation by the great theological teachers of the East".⁴⁵

The central idea of the text is emphasized in the title which, in turn, reminds one of a medical diagnosis. The basic metaphor of "crisis" helps the author to discover a subject of reflection, because it reduces it to more or less visible limits. This helps the author to focus on the concepts he considered most important from his point of view and from the point of further development of Western philosophy. Here we can see an obvious duality in the metaphor of *The Crisis* (the crisis as a negative result of the previous development, and also the period and condition of transition to a better situation). For the author, it "inspires a research program dedicated to its paraphrase and normalization".⁴⁶ From the beginning he describes how the rationalistic vision has led European philosophy to a standstill. By the end he has found the "absurdities" in von Hartmann's philosophy which have to be overcome; and indirectly this provides a way out of the current crisis.

The subject in *The Crisis* is not European philosophy, strictly speaking, but "general results of philosophic development". This means that the author is trying to find a final, or the latest result of Western philosophy from his point of view. And he points at the philosophy of von Hartmann as the most representative result. But the broadness of the topic has forced him

⁴⁵ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* // Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/—Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. — p. 149 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 122). A part of the dramatic effect of Solovyov's conclusions is reduced in Boris Yakim's translation, but it still keeps the energy of discourse. In the Russian text, the conclusion about the spiritual contemplation of the East comes suddenly, as *Deus ex machina*, after the author has just removed the absurdities in the "Philosophy of the Unconscious". The most surprising of Solovyov's conclusions is omitted in the English translation: Таким образом, эта новейшая философия с логическим совершенством западной формы стремится соединить полноту духовных созерцаний Востока. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, Там же).

⁴⁶ Hymers M. *Metaphor, Cognitivity, and Meaning-Holism // Philosophy and Rhetoric*, vol. 31, № 4 — 1998, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996. — p. 278.

to look through all the important, or at least most of the serious conceptions in the history of European philosophy. Solovyov shows partiality in his choice: he takes the most representative European idealists, starting from the scholastics, and sticks to his own view without losing it in the flood of ideas. This certainly was very difficult for a “philosopher of the age of the draft” (“философ призывного возраста” as journalists called him after he defended his dissertation and became known as a good scholar).⁴⁷

Naturally, the author himself chose the *dramatis personae* for his work, and representatives of classical German philosophy presented the majority of these. For example, the main ideas of the scholastics from John Scotus Erigena to Thomas Aquinas were described on a mere two pages only, but with the author’s reservation that there is “an analogy between scholasticism and modern philosophy (up to and including Hegel). The essence of both is the conflict between the autonomous reason (of the thinking I) and a principle external to it: in scholasticism, the external authority of the Church, with historical externality; in modern philosophy, the external being of nature, with physical externality”.⁴⁸ The parallelism here is based here on the metaphor of antagonistic dualism.

In the Prologue, according to the rules of drama, the author should introduce the characters. In the text of *The Crisis*, for Solovyov as a narrator, the role of a given philosopher as character in the context of the problems he discusses was more important than a development of that personage’s thoughts. That is why the characters of the Introduction (John Erigena, Thomas Aquinas, and Descartes) are quite functional, taking their places in the scheme of development that Solovyov mentions at the end of the fifth chapter as a classical scheme of syllogism.⁴⁹ The plan of the

⁴⁷ As was mentioned in Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 136. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

⁴⁸ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 18 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 11).

⁴⁹ “The mutual relation of three phases in the development of rationalism can be expressed as follows:

(*Major* of dogmatism): That which truly is, is known in a priori knowledge.

(*Minor* of Kant): But in a priori knowledge, only the forms of our thoughts are known.

(*Conclusio* of Hegel): *Ergo*, the forms of our thoughts are that which truly is.

Or:

We think that which is.

But we think only concepts.

Ergo, that which is, is a concept.

composition of the historical narrative in the Introduction and first chapter of Solovyov's dissertation is represented very clearly in this scheme.

The structure of the whole plan and composition of the text is more complicated, and cannot be reduced to such a concise scheme (which is always easier to create when you tell a story about the distant past). This algorithm of narration was needed at the beginning, where the author had to explain the nature of the crisis. It is interesting to note that none of the opponents and critics argued against this scheme; it was accepted unanimously as a sign of the good philosophical training of the author.

The complexity of the plot is connected with the fact that the systems of Schopenhauer, von Hartmann, and Comte were analyzed by the author as non-classical (contrary to Kant, Fichte, and Hegel), and Solovyov could challenge them and reproach them for "the constant hypostasization of the relative, abstract concepts".⁵⁰ So the narrative in accordance with the scheme of syllogism ends with the system of Hegel. After that, we find examples of analysis of the contemporary conceptions of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann. The narrative itself can be divided into two parts – the formal scheme of development starting from scholasticism up to Schopenhauer (Introduction and post-Kantian period), and the outline of the two latest systems. Von Hartmann's system is even contemporary with that of Solovyov himself, as far as it is possible to talk about Solovyov's system in 1874 when *The Crisis* was completed. The restricted character of their work, in the author's opinion, is their one-sidedness and limitation, the quality that is applied to all previous systems, both classical and modern.

The interesting fact is that the author does not make a clear distinction between historical and polemical types of description of philosophic systems, which means that there is a complex mechanism of interrelation between them. His initial remark qualifies pure, rational philosophy as a way of thinking on the road towards decline, because it has ended its develop-

The empirical tendency presents a similar course of development. The interrelationship of the stage in the development of empiricism can be expressed in the following syllogism:

(*Major* of Bacon) That which truly is, is known in our actual experience.

(*Minor* of Locke *et al.*). But in our real experience only different empirical states of consciousness are known.

(*Conclusio* of Mill). *Ergo*, the different empirical states of consciousness are that which truly is". (Ibid. p. 131–132 (Там же. С. 106–107))

⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 104 (Там же. С.84).

ment and “passed irretrievably into the world of the past”.⁵¹ After that the author characterizes several trends of European philosophy – abstract spiritualism and materialism – as “distinguished by immaturity of thought”.⁵² Here we can see an influence of Slavophilism on Solovyov, namely he accepts I. Kireyevsky’s diagnosis of Western philosophy. Mochulsky wrote about an influence of Kireyevsky’s ideas on the early Solovyov, especially the idea that “in the West reason had come to the recognition of its limited character and negativity”.⁵³

The conclusion to be drawn with respect to the compositional structure of *The Crisis*, is that it is built like a drama with a long *Vorgeschichte* (Introduction and Chapter 1), which is structured in accordance with a scheme of syllogism (the scheme itself appears only in Chapter 5), and the long action as a struggle of the last character (von Hartmann) “to transform Schopenhauer’s doctrine, removing its one-sidedness”, and the result of it.⁵⁴ There is a clear distinction between the historical type of narration at the beginning of Solovyov’s work in which the classical systems are described, and the more dramatic narration on the contemporary systems of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann. I will analyze the second (novelistic) type of narration later, in section 2.5.

2.3. Solovyov’s Account of the History of Western Philosophy

Generally speaking, Solovyov’s account of Western philosophy is rather traditional for his time and obviously close to the Slavophile and more broadly, to Hegelian tradition. I have already mentioned several parallels between Hegel and Solovyov in section 2.1. *The Crisis* is not a history of philosophy in a proper sense, because, first, it has a clearly polemical goal of criticizing positivism. Positivists, according to Solovyov, “consider abstract philosophical development” fruitless, and the only thing we can conclude from this is that, contrary to positivists, Solovyov valued philosophy and its history. Secondly, *The Crisis* does not make

⁵¹ Ibid. p. 11 (Там же. С.5).

⁵² Ibid. p. 136 (Там же. С.110).

⁵³ Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М.: Республика, 1995. – С. 90–91. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*)

⁵⁴ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 86. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 69).

Solovyov's conception and method of historico-philosophical study explicit, and finally, does not outline the development of Ancient philosophy, which is considered a starting point for most existing general histories of philosophy. That is why I do not focus on the latest discussions of issues of history of philosophy,⁵⁵ because the purpose of my analysis is different, namely to examine the role of Solovyov's historico-philosophical conception in *The Crisis*.

I would like, first, to classify Solovyov's account of history of philosophy according to several well-known theories in this field. Jorge Gracia represents the most elaborate present-day classification. Gracia puts at the beginning of his account of thirteen approaches that those "are certainly not exhaustive. Nor are they exclusive, for, as already noted, often one will find several of them in the work of a single historian".⁵⁶ Solovyov's account of European philosophy can be described clearly in terms of Gracia's classification of thirteen approaches to the history of philosophy. In his opinion, there are three nonphilosophical approaches: The Culturalist, The Psychologist, The Ideologue. Among philosophical approaches we find: A. Historical Approaches: The Golden Age Nostalgic, The Romantic, The Scholar, The Doxographer, including a. Life and Thought Doxographer, b. Univocal Question Doxographer, c. History of Ideas Doxographer; B. Polemical Approaches: The Apologist, The Literary Critic; The Dilettante, The Idealist, The Problematicist, The Eschatologist. Solovyov's is certainly a philosophical and polemical approach, although we can find a rudimentary trace of the Slavophile vision and its traditional criticism of Western rationalism in *The Crisis*, which is in turn a sign of the ideological approach, as in Gracia's classification.⁵⁷ There is also a Golden Age Nostalgic element, namely the lost synthesis and unity of early Christianity, because Solovyov talks about restoration of this unity. Gracia claims that the Ideologue is "not looking for truth and discoveries" and makes use "of the history of philosophy only for rhetorical reasons, that is, to convince an audience of what they have already achieved".⁵⁸ But certainly there is some

⁵⁵ See Holland A.J. /Editor/ *Philosophy, its History and Historiography* – Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1983. – 335 p., and the short survey of discussions by Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Historiography of Philosophy. Istoriko-Filosofskaja Nauka* – Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1997. – pp. 1–7.

⁵⁶ See Gracia J.J.E. *Philosophy and Its History. Issues in Philosophical Historiography* – Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992 – pp. 223–294.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 232.

⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 224.

element of “the fight with the West” in *The Crisis*, when Solovyov judges one-sided rationalism to be typically Western.

Solovyov’s approach to the history of philosophy in *The Crisis*, apart from its Eurocentrism, can be called eschatologist, in Gracia’s sense. Gracia claims that “the most notorious eschatologist of all times is Hegel, although the roots of the eschatological reading of history go as far back as Augustine, and his Jewish and Christian sources. Hegel not only thought that all philosophies climaxed in his philosophy but, more than that, he held that his thought was the ultimate culmination of philosophical understanding, beyond which no further development would be possible: The Absolute became revealed in Hegel’s philosophy”.⁵⁹ In Gracia’s vision, “the main characteristic in the eschatological approach” is “the teleological element that governs the reading and interpretation of ideas”.⁶⁰ The teleological element in Solovyov’s account of history of philosophy, leads to the “*universal synthesis* of science, philosophy, and religion”. There is one more major factor to account for Solovyov’s position as eschatologist. Later, at the end of the 1890s, towards the end of his life, Solovyov’s vision of history became eschatologist in a purely Christian, if not apocalyptic, sense; this is obvious in his last major work, *Three Conversations*. There are several occasions where Solovyov’s approach coincides with that of the Golden Age nostalgic, the romantic, and the univocal question doxographer’s approach in his search for “the restoration of the complete inner *unity of the intellectual world*”. But generally, the eschatological element dominates in Solovyov’s account of history of philosophy, of course, in Gracia’s sense.

In the sense of John Passmore, Solovyov’s vision of the history of philosophy can be called retrospective. As Passmore put it: “From the point of view of the retrospective historian, history is not a mere succession of opinions which the historian has the responsibility of marking “true” or “false”, but rather a gradual development towards the truth being now fully apparent once and for all. This means that retrospective history has the character of a continuous narrative, as doxographical history does not. Furthermore, it is able to describe the philosopher as a struggling thinker, not merely as someone who “holds a view” or “adopts a position”.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Ibid. p. 274.

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 275.

⁶¹ Passmore J. *The Idea of a History of Philosophy // History and Theory*, N 5 – The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1965. – pp. 22–23. For Solovyov, the development of history of European philosophy led up to the crisis of that time, as he

This tradition in the history of philosophy is “exemplified in Hegel’s works”.⁶² For Solovyov as a retrospective historian of philosophy in this sense, Hegel’s vision of the history of philosophy is important, namely that “the latest philosophy contains those which went before; it embraces in itself all the different stages thereof; it is the product and result of those that preceded it”.⁶³ Solovyov writes “as a philosopher of the history of philosophy rather than as a historian of philosophy”,⁶⁴ because, first, he does not mention all the European philosophers he knew,⁶⁵ but mostly those he considered to be representative of the European school of rational philosophy, and, secondly, he reflects on the development of philosophy in Europe, taking into account “the very near future”, which has been bequeathed “a complete resolution of those questions, which were resolved one-sidedly and therefore unsatisfactorily in the course of that development”.⁶⁶

Finally, Solovyov’s synthetic approach to the history of philosophy can be classified according to White. Solovyov’s vision of history is that of “The Organicist;”⁶⁷ Solovyov uses the metaphor of Crisis in a medical sense (at least we cannot exclude such an interpretation), and the synthesis he

saw it, and, in a sense of Benedetto Croce, *The Crisis* has a character of “contemporary history” (Croce B. *History as the Story of Liberty* – London, 1941. – p. 17), first of all, because Solovyov is focused on the criticism of positivism as the latest and most influential contemporary trend in philosophy.

⁶² Ibid. p. 22.

⁶³ Ibid. p. 23.

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 24.

⁶⁵ Paracelsus, Jakob Boehme, and Emanuel Swedenborg are not mentioned, because Solovyov clearly recognized their place outside of the European philosophical mainstream, although he valued them as philosophers with mystical experience.

⁶⁶ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 12 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 5).

⁶⁷ “Organicist word hypothesis and their corresponding theories of truth and argument are relatively more “integrative” and hence reductive in their operations. The organicist attempts to depict the particulars discerned in the historical field as components of synthetic process. At the heart of the Organicist strategy is a metaphysical commitment to paradigm of the microcosmic-macrocosmic relationship; and the Organicist historian will tend to be governed by the desire to see individual entities as components of the process which aggregate into wholes that are greater than, or qualitatively different from, the sum of their parts”. (White H. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* – London: John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – p. 15)

suggests is, in this sense, a “remedy” for Western philosophy as an organism in crisis. This search for a synthesis of opposite principles in an organicist manner constitutes the main factor in the plot of “eternal return” at the end of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. But Solovyov’s turn to the synthesis, and the return to the “spiritual contemplations by the great theological teachers of the East” appear rather unexpectedly in the last chapter of his first major work. In section 2.14, I will take up the question of the emplotment used by Solovyov in *The Crisis*.

For the reader, *The Crisis* offers as something new not only a critical vision of European philosophy as a whole, but also an analysis of the pros and cons of different systems within rationalism which, according to the author, has ended its development.⁶⁸ This is a unique perspective, which we can find only in Solovyov’s account of the history of Western philosophy. Later, in Chapters 2, 3, and 4, the author does digress from the chronicle, and consecutive narration. I will deal with these changes in chapter 2.5.

To conclude this section, I want to outline my own classification of Solovyov’s account of the history of philosophy. It is an eschatological (in Garcia), retrospective (in Passmore), and organicist (in White) account. I think it also presents the teleological and synthetic conception of the history of philosophy, in the sense that it moves towards the final goal – the synthesis with science and religion. Solovyov’s conception is not retrospective only because it not only approaches the truth, but the truth itself is expected to become clear in the future. And the author sees this coming truth in “synthesis”. In this respect, it is a prospective account of the history of philosophy. To go further, it is a prophetic vision of the history of philosophy, because this truth has already been given in “faith and

⁶⁸ It was already done by the Slavophiles, and Solovyov mentioned in the footnotes “certain articles of I. Kireyevsky and Khomyakov” (Ibid. p. 172 (Tam je S. 34)). These articles, probably, are I. Kireyevsky’s “О необходимости и возможности новых начал для философии” (*On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy*), “О характере просвещения Европы и о его отношении к просвещению в России” (*On the Nature of European Culture and Its Relationship to Russian Culture*), “Ответ Хомякову” (*A Reply to Khomyakov*) and “Обозрение современного состояния литературы” (*A Review of the Current State of Affairs in Literature*). All of them were published in different magazines in the 1840s-1850s, and appeared together more than half a century later in: Киреевский И. В. Полное собрание сочинений, в 2-х т. – М.: Путь, 1911 (Kireyevsky I. *Complete Collection of Works*). The most comprehensive English edition is: *On Spiritual Unity. A Slavophile Reader* /Translated and edited by Boris Yakim and Robert Bird/ – Houndon: Lindisfarne Books, 1998. – p. 365.

spiritual contemplation by the great theological teachers of the East”,⁶⁹ and in fact it should be re-opened as a result of the coming “universal synthesis”. Solovyov’s account is prophetic, because he actually predicts, and makes explicit that von Hartmann’s philosophy, while rational in its basis, “extends its hand to religion”, which already contains the truth.

2.4. The Functions of the Characters in Solovyov’s Narrative

In this chapter, I will describe the different functions of the characters in Solovyov’s narrative about European philosophy, and compare their functions to those in some generally recognized conceptions of the history of philosophy.

Before Solovyov starts telling his story about European philosophy, he implicitly sets the perspective of the coming “*unity of the intellectual world*”, which is to be explained in the last chapter of *The Crisis*. The principle of the plot of Solovyov’s work is that philosophy “has ended its development”.⁷⁰ Thus Solovyov’s story of the crisis of philosophy turns out to be a narration from the point of view of something which is no longer philosophy. Later, Solovyov finds a proper name for this doctrine: theosophy or, to be precise, “free theosophy or integral knowledge”.⁷¹ However, in *The Crisis*, it is true that the author tells the story from a position which is not clearly defined. It does not have much in common with philosophy, because philosophy has “ended” and should be incorporated in something new. This precondition automatically draws Solovyov’s point of view in *The Crisis* out of the ordinary historical time of philosophic development, “beyond” it, rather than “after”. However, the author’s narration stays within the framework of history of philosophy, because he tells the story consecutively, as philosophy developed through history. This is why the narrative of *The Crisis* is unique, especially for that time; it assesses the philosophical development in Europe from the point of view of a synthetic “free theosophy” (post-philosophy), which was to be explained by the author only some years later, in different works. One can even say that *The Crisis* has been written from a perspective which is still to be developed and

⁶⁹ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p.149 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т.2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 121).

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 11 (Там же. С.5).

⁷¹ Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 175 (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*).

clarified. The main peculiarity connected with this paradox is that the characters in *The Crisis* are, on the one hand, ordinary personages of a traditional history of philosophy. On the other hand, they are all “theoretical philosophers”, i.e. participants in a process that has already ended; moreover, it is a process in which something has gone “wrong” – at least from the point of view of the author. That is why one can find many similarities between Solovyov’s account of previous developments of European philosophy and accounts of folklore and mythology, where the characters (personages) have their own traditional functions.

From the point of view of the narrative analysis there is no big difference between a narration on mythological events and a narration on events of the intellectual history in connection with functions of the philosophers in this history. By the time when Solovyov completed *The Crisis*, the major facts of the history of European philosophy (especially German, French and English) were discovered and described by many scholars and the tradition of describing the European philosophical mainstream had been formed. There is no evidence that Solovyov delved into this tradition and used many of existing histories of philosophy, but he followed the general trend of history of European philosophy keeping the chronological order. So he operated in the existing and developing narrative tradition of writing histories of philosophy. That is why I make a parallel between mythological and historico-philosophical narrations.

At the same time, this story, written in the epoch of the great development of Russian literature of the 19th century, could hardly avoid taking on some features of *belles lettres*. It is possible to perceive a novelistic narration in *The Crisis* and I will discuss it in section 2.5.⁷²

According to Solovyov, philosophy “begins with a split between individual thought as reason and the common national faith as authority”; is “rooted in the split between the individual and society”; “is always a matter of personal reason”; and “is therefore the beginning of the split between theory and practice, between school and life”.⁷³ Taking Solovyov’s portrayal

⁷² “Novelistic” means the highly developed and sophisticated type of narration, in which unpredictability, complication of composition, a variety of “chronotopes” and conceptions of causality are the basic values. For details see Martin W. *Recent Theories of Narrative* – Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986. – pp. 42–53.

⁷³ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – pp. 12, 13, 112 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 6, 7, 91).

of philosophy for granted, I can represent philosophy as a system of texts created by those “personal reasons”; the history of philosophy, accordingly, is an autonomous space of thought within culture. Here, in the first place, there is a competition between “the world-view of separate individuals” and “the common world-view of nations and tribes” as it gives rise to philosophy; in the second place, for philosophy time passes slightly differently.⁷⁴ Every subsequent moment of philosophical time does not abolish the previous moment, but acquires, on the one hand, a value in connection with a system of postulates and concepts as its basic element, and, on the other hand, has its own value as “a matter of personal reason”. “Philosophic time” has a starting point in the narrative of Solovyov, namely the moment when “for thinking individuals, the faith of the nation ceases to be their own faith, loses for them the significance of an inner unconscious conviction, and, instead of a principle of life, becomes merely an object of thought;”⁷⁵ and its end is “the restoration of the complete inner unity of the intellectual world in the fulfillment of the testament of the ancient wisdom”.⁷⁶ In other words, the end of philosophy is already clear to the author. But from the perspective of a certain future unity of the intellectual world, Solovyov himself had to do something in philosophy that corresponds well with an episode occurring a few months after the defense of the dissertation. Getting drunk during a party in a London pub, Solovyov told his friends that he “already had done much more than Vissarion Belinsky,⁷⁷ and hoped to go far beyond him and higher”.⁷⁸ This is

⁷⁴ Ibid. p. 13 (Там же. С. 6).

⁷⁵ Ibid. (Там же).

⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 149 (Там же. С. 122).

⁷⁷ A famous Russian literary critic. For details see: *Belinsky and Different Variants of Westernism* // Walicki A. *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism* /Translated from the Polish by H.Andrews-Rusiecka/ – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980 – pp. 135–151; Firsov V. *Vissarion Belinsky // A History of Russian Philosophy. From the Tenth Through the Twentieth Centuries*, in two Vols., Vol. 1 /Edited by Valery Kuvakin/– Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1994 – pp. 207–218.

⁷⁸ Янжул И.И. Из воспоминаний о Вл. С. Соловьеве // Владимир Соловьев: Pro et contra. Личность и творчество Владимира Соловьева в оценке русских мыслителей и исследователей. Антология – СПб.: Изд-во Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 2000 – С. 101–102 (Yanzhul I. *From the Memoirs on Vl. Solovyov*// *Vladimir Solovyov: Pro et Contra. Personality and Works of Vladimir Solovyov in the Evaluation of Russian Thinkers and Researchers*– St. Petersburg: Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute Press, 2000. – pp. 101–102) The same story is also described in Maxim Kovalevsky’s *From the Memoirs on Vl.Solovyov*. Ibid. p. 106 (Там же. С. 106).

a significant episode in the life of Solovyov, revealing his plans at the beginning of his career; according to the Russian proverb, “What a sober person has in mind is on the tongue of the drunk”.

The main characters of the text are the philosophers and their systems, i.e. sets of ideas and postulates differing from the common worldview or the traditional way of thinking. The combination of elements in the portrayal of a given philosopher depends on his role in the narrative or function in the subject of the text.⁷⁹ To some extent, this corresponds with Solovyov’s opinion: “The deed is done as soon as the thought is expressed”.⁸⁰

There is a dialogue (dispute, controversy) between characters in this philosophical space inspired by the author. The dialogue certainly has a mythopoetic nature because it exists only as a domain of different discourses of the characters. These characters are not only personalities, like names from a dictionary of philosophy, where the central purpose is to give the reader information about philosophers and their theories, a doxography. Solovyov does more, describing personal systems of thoughts (Descartes, Kant, Hegel, etc.) or, better still, personal mythologies, and these sometimes move their creators off to the background, at the will of the Author who has created a narrative on the crisis of European rationalism. The Author-Describer thus shows his power over the characters, for in the text we see only the material corresponding to his theme, the crisis of Western philosophy. According to Solovyov, the reason of the crisis is “the one-sided dominance of rational analysis, which affirms abstract concepts in their separateness and therefore necessarily hypostasizes them”.⁸¹ When Solovyov describes a philosophic system, all the details of the “non-philosophic” life of his characters remain outside the narrative. This is not because he was incapable of writing in a livelier manner, adding particular details of their lives. Solovyov realized this purpose later in the philosophic biographies of Kant, Hegel, von Hartmann in the *Brokgauz – Efron*

⁷⁹ Пропп В.Я. Морфология сказки – М.: Наука, 1969. – С.30. (Propp V. *Morphology of Fairy-tale*). According to Vladimir Propp, “The function is an action of a character, defined from the point of its meaning for all the events in the narrative”.

⁸⁰ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 112 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 91(Solovyov V. *Works*, in 2 vols.).

⁸¹ Ibid. p. 103 (Там же. С. 84).

Encyclopedia.⁸² The narrative aims to elaborate a conception, not to describe the history of European philosophy, or to entertain the reader by idiosyncratic facts of biography.

It is hard to say whether the author's knowledge of the life of his characters was in proportion to their proximity to him in time. He mostly quoted from their works, not from the secondary literature about them.⁸³ By Solovyov's time the bibliography of works about Kant or Hegel, for example, was extensive; but I have not found any traces of Solovyov's active reading of secondary works on the characters of *The Crisis*.⁸⁴ On the contrary, in his correspondence he emphasized that he was studying German philosophers, and reading Greek and Latin theologians at the Moscow Spiritual Academy in 1873.⁸⁵

In the Introduction to *The Crisis*, all the characters we meet are functional, and equated with their main ideas. This means that they have yielded their place in the Introduction to their systems. For example, "the first medieval thinker" John Scot Erigena is represented by a long quotation from his work, *De divisione naturae*, and in fact in the narrative of *The Crisis* he is only represented as the author of the statement: "Thus, only reason is true, and authority loses all significance. If authority is in accord with reason, it is obviously *not necessary*. If it contradicts reason, it is *false*".⁸⁶ The function of Erigena in the narrative is the formulation of the

⁸² They were published in Russian as a separate book: Философский словарь Владимира Соловьева – Ростов на Дону, Феникс, 1997. (*Philosophic Dictionary of Vladimir Solovyov*).

⁸³ Mikhail Vladislavlev noted this as a sign of the good quality of a dissertation. "Solovyov is familiar with most important philosophers through their own works, not through secondary literature". (Владиславлев М. И. Кризис западной философии против позитивистов, Владимира Соловьева // Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения – СПб., 1875, январь. – С. 259. (Vladislavlev M. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy Against Positivists*, by Vladimir Solovyov // *Journal of the Ministry of Education*, 1875).

⁸⁴ He recommends to the reader the work of A. Stockl *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (*History of Medieval Philosophy*) in 3 vols., and does not go deeply into the outline and critique of Hegel's system. He refers a reader to the articles by N.G-v (Nikita Gilyarov-Platonov) in *Russkaya Beseda*, 1859, vol.3. Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute / Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – pp. 170, 172. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 9, 34).

⁸⁵ Соловьев В.С. Письма (под ред. Э.Л. Радлова), в 4-х т., Т. 3 – СПб.: Время, 1908–1923. – С. 106 (Solovyov V. *Letters* in 4 Vols.).

⁸⁶ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 14. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 8).

question whether authority is necessary at all in the sphere of thought. This already has a double function. On the one hand, it points to the role of a cultural hero.⁸⁷ According to Solovyov, Erigena starts a new (or forgotten) type of cultural activity – philosophical doubt, which still does not go beyond the limits set by its “lady”, theology (*philosophia est ancilla theologiae*). On the other hand, we find the role of the trickster within the system of the medieval world-view based on the authority of faith.

Let us examine how Erigena’s functions in Solovyov’s narrative correspond to the role of Erigena in other histories of philosophy. Bertrand Russell states at the beginning of his chapter on John the Scot that “he set reason above faith, and cared nothing for the authority of ecclesiastics; yet his arbitrament was invoked to settle their controversies”.⁸⁸ Only after this statement, Russell starts to explain Erigena’s philosophy “as an integral part of social and political life” in his time, and to analyze the social context of Erigena’s life, and give some quotations from *On Division of Nature*.

The author of one of the most comprehensive histories of philosophy, Frederick Copleston, in the chapter on the “Life and works” of Erigena, mentions both possible interpretations of Erigena’s main idea and states that “there is a dispute about its correct interpretation”.⁸⁹ So, I can conclude that Solovyov, in his vision, was close to the Hegelian vision of

⁸⁷ I use this term from semiotics and myth studies to denote the paramount importance of the input a philosopher brings to the text of *The Crisis*, in the sense that the idea or theory of the philosopher has a great significance for the future development of philosophy. “Cultural hero of the type of Prometheus-Dionysus” // Vries A. de *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery* – Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1974. – p. 250. See also Мелетинский Е.М. Поэтика мифа – М.: Восточная литература, РАН, 2000. – С. 178–194. (Meletinsky Y. *Poetics of Myth*) and Мифологический словарь /главный редактор Е.М. Мелетинский/ – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1991. – С. 665–666. (Meleletinsky Y. /Editor-in-chief/ *Dictionary of Myth*).

⁸⁸ Russell B. *A History of Western Philosophy and Its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* – New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945. – p. 400.

⁸⁹ “Those scholars who maintain his orthodox intentions can point to such statements as that “the authority of the Sacred Scripture must be followed in all things, while those who maintain that he regarded reason as superior to theology, and anticipated the Hegelian rationalism can point, for example, to the statement that “every authority” (e.g. that of the Fathers) “which is not confirmed by true reason seems to be weak, whereas true reason does not need to be supported by any authority”. (Copleston F. *A History of Philosophy*, in 9 vols, vol. 2 – New York: Image Books, 1985. – p. 114).

the superiority of reason and philosophy, which he probably took from Hegel's and Kuno Fischer's histories of philosophy.⁹⁰

Solovyov did not aim to refute religion for the thousand and first time. He was rather looking for a new place for it in society and trying to justify it (the favourite term of Solovyov, taking into account his *The Justification of the Good*). The subject of the narrative in *The Crisis* is a restoration of a religious role for philosophy, and its union with religion and science. In the Introduction, the "mono-functional" characters might have more functions, but the critical attitude of the author towards abstract metaphysics did not allow him to develop stories about his personages (according to Solovyov, abstract spiritualism "is distinguished by immaturity of thought"). So here we find the following mono-functional characters of *The Crisis*.

Abelard's function is the elaboration of a method to reveal truth. It is confirmed by the Latin formula, which reads as follows in Solovyov's interpretation: "The internal contradiction of authority elicits *doubts*; doubts stimulate *inquiry*; inquiry reveals *truth*".⁹¹ Solovyov's account of Abelard is based on his role of strengthening philosophic (rational) inquiry in the history of European philosophy; this role differs from that of more detailed histories of philosophy (Russell and Copleston, in particular). Abelard's life, dialectics, decisiveness, combativeness, and "habit of criticizing pundits" were mostly highlighted by other historians of philosophy.⁹² Solovyov did not pay attention to the famous facts of his life at all, although he studied Abelard's *Sic et non* and *Historia calamitatum*, and certainly knew about the peculiar turns of his life. The account of Abelard's contribution to rational philosophy is limited to his function of advocating philosophical investigation.

Ludwig Feuerbach denotes the anthropological turn in German philosophy, as is affirmed by the following quotation: "Humanity's being is its higher being. Although religion calls the supreme being God, and considers

⁹⁰ On Erigena and his thesis of reason's superiority over the authority see Fischer K. *Geschichte der neuern Philosophie*, in 10 vols., vol. 1, 5th edition – Heidelberg: Karl Winter's Buchhandlung, 1912. – pp. 60–61.

⁹¹ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 16. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 9).

⁹² Russell B. *A History of Western Philosophy and Its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* – New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945. – p. 438.

him an objective being, in truth this is only humanity's own being. Therefore, the turning point of universal history consists in the fact that, from now on, God for humanity must be not *God, but humanity*".⁹³ Solovyov's account of Feuerbach is connected with the "transition *ad hominem*" in German philosophy, which is a traditional role for Feuerbach in studies of Western philosophy. For example, for John Randall he was, first and foremost, "the thinker who pushed secularism and naturalistic humanism furthest".⁹⁴ This is Randall's general statement about Feuerbach; the rest of his account of Feuerbach's life and philosophy⁹⁵ is included in the context of his vision of philosophy as "a social and cultural enterprise" and "the expression of thought of cultural change itself: it is the intellectual phase or moment of the process by which conflicts within a civilization are analyzed and clarified, resolved and composed".⁹⁶ In Solovyov's narrative, Feuerbach plays the role of a transition from "the individual's own self-assertion"

⁹³Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 117 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 95). Feuerbach, in fact, is represented again in a footnote with another pun (Solovyov does mention that Feuerbach was "witty and talented"): "Der Mensch ist was er isst" (Man is what he eats). This, first of all, demonstrates Solovyov's own evaluation and partiality for a play of words, and secondly, it shows that such clever phrases were an important element of the philosophical characteristic given by Solovyov.

⁹⁴ Randall J.H. *The Career of Philosophy*, in 3 vols., vol. II – New York: Columbia University Press, 1965 – p. 365.

⁹⁵ Ibid. pp. 365–374. It is 9 pages long and is, as far as I know, one of the most extensive accounts of Feuerbach's philosophy in a general history of philosophy. By comparison, Russell mentions his name once in connection with Feuerbach's "revolt against Hegel towards materialism" (Russell, p. 783). James Collins also mentions him once. (Collins J. *A History of Modern European Philosophy* – Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1954. – p. 616). Frederick Copleston emphasizes Feuerbach's theological interests. Feuerbach "can be said, therefore, to have substituted anthropology for theology. With the substitution of anthropology for theology man becomes his own highest object, an end to himself". (Copleston F. *A History of Philosophy*, in 9 vols, vol. 7 – New York: Image Books, 1985. – pp. 294–299) Copleston analyzes Feuerbach's philosophy in close connection with Hegelian philosophy as "the transformation of idealism". Solovyov's account of Feuerbach is more a link between Hegel and socialism, without any reference to Marx, to whom Solovyov hardly paid any attention.

⁹⁶ Randall J.H. *The Career of Philosophy*, in 3 vols., vol. 1 – New York: Columbia University Press, 1965. – p.6. Randall's account of history of philosophy is characterized by John Passmore as "cultural history of philosophy" (Passmore J. *Philosophy, Historiography of // The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, in 8 vols., vol. 6 – London: The Macmillan Company, 1967. – p. 228).

to socialism and, further, to “an exclusive individualism” as represented by Max Stirner.⁹⁷

Stirner’s function is the “apotheosis of egoism” – “The absolute, exclusive self-assertion of the “I” becomes the unique principle of life”.⁹⁸ In Solovyov’s narrative, it represents a culminating point of rationalism. The quotations from Stirner’s *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* (The Ego and His Own) signify the moment of extreme one-sidedness and limitation. Solovyov characterizes it by the statement: “Thus, after philosophical rationalism rejected all objective reality in *theory*, all the objective principles of morality are now being rejected in *practice*”.⁹⁹

The single functions of the characters I have mentioned are connected to the author’s central idea, which is to show the negative sides of rationalism, starting from the revolt of Erigena and Abelard against religious dogmatic authority, and ending with the negation of moral norms and limits by Feuerbach and Stirner.

Let us go back to the “Introduction”, where the aim is not so complicated – just to outline the history of the problem, and to pave the way for a subsequent novelistic discourse with many characters, interrup-

⁹⁷ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 – pp. 118–119 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 96–97). There is an account about Stirner who “scoffed at all moral idealism” (in Randall’s *The Career of Philosophy*, vol. 2, p. 364–365), but in the same chapter, and before the analysis of Feuerbach. It means that Solovyov considered Stirner a more radical rationalist than Feuerbach. Solovyov’s account of Stirner is more symbolic than that of a cultural historian of philosophy (Randall in this case). Solovyov puts together the claims with respect to Stirner as a radical rationalist and a philosopher who rejects “the objective principles of morality”. Randall, of course, does not criticize rationalism as such. He criticizes Stirner only for rejecting moral idealism. Copleston mentions Stirner’s philosophy “not for any anticipation of later thought, but rather as a phase in the movement of revolt against metaphysical idealism. Apart, however, from the fact that Stirner was far from being a great philosopher, his thought was out of harmony with the *Zeitgeist*, and it is not surprising if Marx saw in it the expression of the alienated isolated individual in a doomed bourgeois society”. Copleston’s account of Stirner’s eccentric philosophy is rather “a counterblast to the general movement of thought in left-wing Hegelianism”. (Copleston, vol. 7, p. 303–304) On the contrary, Solovyov related Stirner to the general context of post-Hegelian philosophy.

⁹⁸ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 – p. 121 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 97).

⁹⁹ Ibid. (Там же).

tions, returns, metaphors of knowledge, and an unexpected logic of narration. The first “multifunctional character” appears to be René Descartes who is mentioned several times, in different ways, in all five chapters. His role is more complicated in comparison with any of his predecessors in Solovyov’s text. He has three functions in Solovyov’s narrative.

First, the principle of “*cogito, ergo sum*”, appears as a parallel to that of Erigena.¹⁰⁰ It creates an inner linkage in the narrative through historic time. The author presents a figure of interruption in the text, although the gap in time is compensated for by the logical link and parallel with Erigena. In the third chapter the author brings these characters together once more, but here the perspective is inverted. After the revolution accomplished in Western philosophy by Descartes, “the essential character of the scholastic world-view was fully preserved”.¹⁰¹ The resurrection of this motif of scholasticism is also connected with “Wolff’s dogmatic metaphysics”.¹⁰²

Another function of Descartes is “the criterion for the truth of our knowledge”, given by Solovyov in its French original in the Russian text. And the third function is an introduction of the notions of “substance”, *res cogitans* and *res extensa*, linking the story with Spinoza, and later – through the denial of the concept of substance – with Leibniz.

Actually, we find a first form of narration (the chronicle) in the Introduction of *The Crisis* only, namely the chronicle of ideas where most characters are not “mono-functional”, but have several functions. In the following chapters the “chronicle” discourse is replaced by the novelistic narration, and some functions are revived in the further development of the story. It is a situation characterized by Barthes as follows: “A separate function (as it appeared in the Introduction) makes sense because it is included in the sphere of action of a certain actant”.¹⁰³

Let us survey the functions of all characters of the Introduction. The author assumes that all of them were looking for the truth. It might be called the function of searching the truth, but the postulates of these characters are completely different. The author shows that there is a big difference between truths of different epochs and countries. It is obvious that there is a chain of ideas connected with the search of truth: Erigena and

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. p. 18 (Там же. С. 10).

¹⁰¹ Ibid. p. 95 (Там же. С. 76).

¹⁰² Ibid. (Там же).

¹⁰³ Barthes R. *Introduction à l’analyse structural de récits // Communications, 8 L’analyse structurale du récit* – Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1981. – p.22.

Descartes (as parallel figures) are connected to “the autocracy of reason”,¹⁰⁴ and this is confirmed by quotations in the original languages (Latin and French) from both thinkers.

Descartes “admits the actual multiplicity of separate things or substances, to which thinking and extension belong as their essential attributes. He admits the genuine existence of a multiplicity of bodies and a multiplicity of spirits”.¹⁰⁵ Traditionally, this is called dualism.

Spinoza is represented by the full “formula of Spinozism”: “By substance I understand that which is in itself, and is understood through itself, i.e. the concept of which doesn’t need the concept of another thing for its formation”,¹⁰⁶ given in Latin, with Solovyov’s translation. Another function of Spinoza is that of a cultural hero who “removed this abstract [Cartesian, I.S.] duality by admitting the substantial identity of thinking and extension, soul and body”.¹⁰⁷

Leibniz’s function in the narrative: “the actual synthesis of the concepts of soul and body was achieved by Leibniz with his principle of the monad” (traditionally, monadology is ascribed to Leibniz).¹⁰⁸

Another function: “a positive result of the philosophical development in Leibniz was the affirmation of the exclusive independence and primordially of physic, or subjective being”.

With the name of Leibniz an interesting novelty enters the text as a constant motif – the possibility of being wrong, the right to make mistakes. Further on, the author also grants other characters as well as himself this right of criticizing the errors of others: “Descartes’s main error, according to Leibniz, consists in the meaningless identification of extension with bodily substances, as a result of a misunderstanding of the nature of substances in general”.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 – p. 18 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 11). It is interesting to note that Solovyov uses the term “autocracy” in a negative sense. In the Russian version he did not use the political term “samoderzhaviye” (autocracy”) but the corresponding abstract noun “samoderzhavnost” as a quality of the state of autocracy. Probably, this is an example of an implicit influence of the tsarist censorship and Solovyov’s self-censorship.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. p. 20. (Там же. С. 12).

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. p. 21. (Там же. С. 13).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 24. (Там же. С. 16).

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. p. 25. (Там же. С. 17).

¹⁰⁹ Ibid. (Там же).

There is a further interruption because, according to the author, the last participants of this race towards truth in European philosophy have come to “the same dual result” from different directions: “an idealistic affirmation and a skeptical question”.¹¹⁰ It happened to the representatives of “the English empirical school” and, because he was not an adherent of British empiricism, preferring German idealism, Solovyov only briefly mentions the main characters of the British tradition.

Bacon is sentenced by the author to being a non-philosopher: “The positive content of his views does not have a philosophical character; it does not transcend the vulgar view, for which the world represented by us has absolute reality with all the multiplicity of its objective content”.¹¹¹

Hobbes too did not evade Solovyov’s accusation of vulgar realism, which “receives a more drastic expression in Hobbes, who attributes existence exclusively to external, bodily being”.¹¹²

Locke: “The whole content of the external world has a subjective character, and external being is only the unknown cause of our sensations”.¹¹³ Locke’s philosophy is outlined so quickly that the next character, Berkeley, is mentioned in the same paragraph. A bit later in Chapter III both these characters get the function of the “stroke on scholasticism”.¹¹⁴

Berkeley: “Thus, all material objects of the external world are only our representations or ideas. Therefore, the external world which consists of these objects does not, as such, have any being outside of our representation. This is Berkeley’s fundamental principle”.¹¹⁵

Hume is just marked by a short note about his main idea that “all we know is rather our impressions and sensations or their reproduction in imagination and thought”.¹¹⁶

After this we find the next interruption because, in Solovyov’s opinion, “a new philosophical development arose beginning with Kant”. On the one hand, the reader here finally leaves the sphere of the general development of philosophy, and enters the domain of German idealism (Strakhov and Vladislavlev criticized Solovyov particularly for that mixture of

¹¹⁰ Ibid. p. 28 (Там же. С. 20).

¹¹¹ Ibid. (Там же).

¹¹² Ibid. p. 29 (Там же. С.21).

¹¹³ Ibid. p. 30 (Там же. С.22).

¹¹⁴ Ibid. p. 95 (Там же. С. 87).

¹¹⁵ Ibid. (Там же).

¹¹⁶ Ibid. p. 32 (Там же. С. 24).

national schools in philosophy)¹¹⁷ and, later, positivism. Here the space of the narrative becomes more complicated, and there are occasions of non-linear and even reverse narration.

In Chapter I of *The Crisis* it is more difficult to outline theories of different characters by formulas (functions) only. Once Kant has come on to the stage, the author follows the logic of German philosophers and expresses their thoughts in his own words. Right to the end of the “Introduction”, Solovyov deals with the exposition of the crisis. The real crisis, according to the author, starts within the domain of 19th century German idealism. From this point the author starts describing modern or contemporary philosophical ideas, and no longer uses a chronological order (where characters follow each other with some interruptions). The discourse of a chronicle now ends. Many inversions appear in the text. For example, Chapter I starts with an inversion which can also be called the quintessence of Solovyov’s Eurocentrism. From the beginning the author asks: “Was it long ago that the human mind (represented by Western thinkers) had finally found a haven in the negative result of positivism, which considered the resolution of the higher questions of thought to be absolutely impossible, and their very posing absurd?”¹¹⁸ And he found a new cultural hero who made “the recent new attempt to solve the problems of thought”.¹¹⁹ The author gives the reader the initial problem, which might be relevant even for a present-day reader, – whether it is possible to solve this problem of thought. Solovyov’s answer is well known – a solution is possible, if the problems are not one-sided “problems of thought” but parts of a synthesis. This points to the central concept for Solovyov’s works and life, the idea of reconciliation of different “abstract principles”. We can see the motif¹²⁰ of “one-sided abstraction” in the passage on the “rational

¹¹⁷ Никольский А. Русский Ориген XIX века Вл.С.Соловьев – СПб.: Наука, 2000. – С. 129–130. (Nikolsky A. *Russian Origen of the 19th Century Vladimir Solovyov*) Strakhov’s major claim is that “Solovyov wrongly represents the process of development of the abstract principles in Western European philosophy Solovyov did not differentiate the national schools enough”. (Ibid. p.129) Vladislavlev claims that “such different thinkers as Spencer, Mill and Comte have been confused and put in the same trend” (Ibid. p. 127).

¹¹⁸ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 34. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 25).

¹¹⁹ Ibid. (Там же).

¹²⁰ “At a higher structural level, groups of words and phrases are joined in conventional action patterns (motives)”. (Martin W. *Recent Theories of Narrative* – Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986. – p. 37).

and empirical types of knowledge” in *The Crisis*.¹²¹ In the following sections we see how the chronicle-narration, in which the “mono-functional” characters have dominated, is replaced by an intriguing novelistic narration, where the characters (sometimes the same as in the previous section) are changed. Now they become “multi-functional” characters with their own mistakes, prejudices, and idols. Now they look like ordinary people with ideas, they become the characters of a novel. They become more independent from the author who created a story. Before I deal with novelistic narration in the next chapter, I want to situate Solovyov’s account of the history of philosophy in existing classifications.

2.5. Novelistic Narration in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*

In sections 2.5–2.14, I shall retrace the features of Solovyov’s narrative which are more complicated than a simple chronicle. The narration can be reversed, complicated by the author’s remarks, and the personages can be involved in a polemic among themselves, giving rise to a diversity of their functions. They are not related only as predecessor-successor. Other kinds of interdependence appear. I call Solovyov’s narration in Chapters 1–5 novelistic, because it creates a certain space for personages to be depicted individually and brings about the element of unpredictability, which is important in a novel.¹²² I do not claim that Solovyov wrote a novel, but some elements of his narrative are definitely novelistic.

On the first page of Chapter I, the author goes “back to Kant” and even to the “dogmatism of Wolff”. The plot of history traditionally unfolds from earlier events to later, and the author shows that German idealism started from “dogmatism”. In Solovyov, the formula of Wolff’s system is given as follows: “this system asserted that we know this objective world (in ontology, rational cosmology, and psychology) by means of reason, that we know it in its essence, as it is in itself”.¹²³ There is another reference to dogmatism at the beginning of Chapter 3, in which we find a short replay of the whole story from the beginning of Western philosophy. The general aim

¹²¹ “Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – pp. 132–133. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 106–107).

¹²² See Martin W. *Recent Theories of Narrative* – Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986. – pp. 31–46.

¹²³ *Ibid.* p. 32 (Там же. С. 24).

of this Chapter is to show “the limitedness of the philosophies of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann in connection with the same limitedness of all Western philosophy”, as the author put in his Table of Contents.¹²⁴ Because of the parallel between the general limitedness of Western philosophy and the limitedness of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann’s philosophies in particular, he had to start once more from scholasticism, to be more persuasive. Scholasticism thus plays the role of “ghost” alongside the *Ding an sich*.¹²⁵

And the role of Kant, another cultural hero in Chapter I, looks unusual. It is not traditional for a writer who, like Solovyov at that time, was influenced by the Slavophiles. The Slavophiles respected Kant no less than they respected Schelling or Hegel, but Kant had a less direct influence on them. In I. Kireyevsky’s and Khomyakov’s works we find hardly any quotation from Kant. For the most part Solovyov follows Slavophile interpretation, and it is traditionally focused on German idealism as the most influential philosophy of the 1810s–40s;¹²⁶ but Solovyov pays far

¹²⁴ We find the page with The Table of Contents in the Russian version of *The Crisis* only. In English it is omitted.

¹²⁵ There is a small difference between the two openings (in the Introduction and in Chapter 3). In first case it was the general introduction of the system of the main characters (from the Scholastics to Hume), in the second, the entire story is briefly repeated in connection with “rational thought” which is, in Solovyov’s opinion, the main obstacle for “integral knowledge” in modern philosophy. At the beginning of this brief return to the starting point of the entire story he says that “the form of rational abstraction remained dominant in the new philosophy as well. Thus, the essential characteristic of the scholastic world-view was fully preserved”. In the first case it was a chronicle consecutive narration, in the second, the narration is focused on the problem which is declared from the beginning but the entire story is re-interpreted because the most important enemy, who bears the name “scholasticism” (function of the mythical foe) “was reborn again in the eighteenth century in a new, superficial and popular form, namely in Wolff’s dogmatic metaphysics”. We can even mention the mythical subject of the werewolf. In Russian this parallel between Wolff and the werewolf is not such a clear thing as in English and I cannot propose that Solovyov felt these similarities of names (at least we cannot find a confirmation), but this coincidence of names is very representative for the story where there are constant motifs (“ghosts”) that appear from time to time to refresh or redirect the readers interest.

¹²⁶ “Such rational thought, which achieved its definitive consciousness and expression in modern German philosophy, combines all phenomena of contemporary European culture into a single common meaning and gives them one common character” (Kireyevsky I. *On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy // On Spiritual Unity. A Slavophile Reader* [Translated and edited by Boris Yakim and Robert Bird/—Hudson: Lindisfarne Books, 1998. — p. 235). Es-

more tribute to Kant while his Slavophile predecessors only selectively analyzed those systems of European philosophy which they appreciated.¹²⁷ We must remember that the dissertation genre dictated the rules here, and demanded a more comprehensive point of view from the author. This is why, in Solovyov's narrative, Kant is generally treated with greater interest than is common for the Slavophiles.

Moreover, in Chapter I von Hartmann becomes its first hero only against the background of Kant. "Dogmatism asserted that this whole world of essence is fully known by reason. Kant proved that this world is also fully posited by reason, and he thereby destroyed it as a real world".¹²⁸ This is a description of Kant's first function in the narrative as one who awakens the human mind. This story of his awakening the mind operated as a mythological creation of a new philosophic paradigm, connected with German idealism. In the space of the narrative, Solovyov declares the crisis of all Western philosophy as it represents a general slumber of the human mind. "The human mind surrendered itself to metaphysical reveries as if in sleep, not giving and not asking for an accounting of their possibility. From this dogmatic reverie it was awakened by Kant".¹²⁹

At the same time, the second function of Kant appears – he is a founding father who has "a successor" in the philosophical development, namely Fichte.¹³⁰ This function is connected with specific themes of German idealism like the "thing in itself", "the original synthetic unity of transcendental apperception", "Absolute subject" (Schelling), "Absolute idea", "the world as will and representation", etc.

pecially I would like to mention Kireevsky's final conclusion: "I believe that German philosophy, in combination with the development it has received in Schelling's final system, could serve us as the most convenient point of departure on our own way from borrowed systems to an independent philosophy that will correspond to the basic principles of ancient Russian civilization and be capable of subordinating the divided civilization of the West to the integral consciousness of believing reason". (Ibid. p. 273)

¹²⁷ They had a right to analyze what they wished because their works were not dissertations like *The Crisis*, which was subjects to certain academic rules.

¹²⁸ Ibid. p. 95 (Там же. С. 77). Solovyov is playing on Kant's saying that Hume awoke him from his dogmatic slumber. Solovyov gives much credit neither to Hume nor English philosophy as a whole.

¹²⁹ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 36 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 26).

¹³⁰ Ibid. p.38. (Там же. С. 29).

The third function of Kant as a character gives birth to the ghost of the *Ding an sich*: the “main proposition on the subjective character of knowledge and the complete inaccessibility for us of things of themselves”.¹³¹ This function elucidates the “hermeneutic code” (according to Barthes), the general aim of which is “to select such formal units that allow us to concentrate, ask, retard and, finally, solve an enigma”.¹³² For this narrative the goal is to solve the problem of the “one-sidedness” of all philosophical systems before Solovyov. The “one-sidedness” resides “in the constant hypostasization of the relative, abstract concepts”.¹³³ For example, in Chapter 2, there are “the results of von Hartmann’s empirical investigation” where we can find the following statements: “the unconscious does not interrupt its own activity” or even “the unconscious thought can only be nonsensuous”.¹³⁴

There are, in Solovyov’s opinion, “successors” of Kant, and their ideas are connected to Kant’s functional propositions. For example, the fourth function of Kant (“the doctrine of the original synthetic unity of transcendental apperception”)¹³⁵ relates him to Fichte, who is his successor” because he “develops Kant’s principle into a complete and closed system”.¹³⁶ This is the first function of Fichte in the narrative. There is an obvious link between two functions based on the principle of succession, although it leads to the current crisis, in Solovyov’s opinion. The relationship of “founding father – successor” was very important to Solovyov (as in any tradition in philosophy). Later, he based his famous work *Plato’s Life-Drama* on the same principle.¹³⁷

The fifth function of Kant in the narrative is his innovation in moral philosophy: he “founded the doctrine of moral *formalism*, in opposition to material ethics, which we find, for example, in ancient philosophy”,¹³⁸

¹³¹ Ibid. p. 35. (Там же. С. 27).

¹³² Barthes R. *S/Z* – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1970. – pp. 38–39 (Барт Р. *S/Z* – М.: Ad marginem, 1994. – С. 30–31.)

¹³³ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 104 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 84).

¹³⁴ Ibid. p. 89. (Там же. С. 71).

¹³⁵ Ibid. p. 39. (Там же. С. 28).

¹³⁶ Ibid. p. 40. (Там же. С. 29).

¹³⁷ Solovyov V. *Politics, Law, and Morality* / Edited and translated by V. Wozniuk/ – New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000. – pp. 213–255.

¹³⁸ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – pp. 143–144. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 116–117).

and this thesis is affirmed by the famous quotations from Kant about “the ultimate goal” and “a person as a goal but not a means”. In spite of the conclusion on “the complete emptiness of formalistic morality” and “common phrases concerning human dignity, the absolute significance of the person, and so forth” the ethical line of the narrative is developed further in Chapter 5 up to the philosophy of von Hartmann. The style of this passage emphasizes the insignificance of Kant’s contribution to moral philosophy, and as a contrast to this poor result the author shortly mentions “a more positive result” in “the philosophy of *immediate feeling*, or *common sense*, founded by Reid”.¹³⁹

The line of novelistic narration is not direct and it returns to the functions of Kant several times.¹⁴⁰ This allows me to call Kant one of the most important characters in the narrative, sharing this role with Hegel, Schopenhauer, and von Hartmann. The situation is quite usual for a classic realistic novel of this time, such as Tolstoi’s *War and Peace* or Dostoyevsky’s *The Karamazov Brothers*, where it is hard to say who is the central character. These great novels present the epic stories characterizing the time, and the personal stories are just important elements of narration.¹⁴¹ The same is the case with *The Crisis*. The characters make their contribution to the general story about the crisis of philosophy. Kant¹⁴² plays a linking role in *The Crisis* more often than other characters. It happens by means of a constant figure (I call it “the ghost” of the *Ding an sich*, in the sense of Umberto Eco¹⁴³) or through the author’s interruption (see section 2.11), or as a result of unexpected parallels. One of those parallels is connected with the result of philosophic development, “the unthinkable dualism, on

¹³⁹ Ibid. p. 143. (Там же. С. 117).

¹⁴⁰ In Barthes opinion, “the mechanism of the subject is set into motion by means of a mixture of the temporary sequence and the logical sequence of facts, when those happened after some event started to be considered as the happened due to this”. (Barthes R. *Introduction a l’analyse structural de recits // Communications, 8 L’analyse structurale du recit* – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – pp. 23–24.

¹⁴¹ The influence of narrative structures of L.Tolstoi and Dostoyevsky on Solovyov’s philosophic narrative can be a separate theme of study, and it might be very interesting to compare the leading narrative and poetic systems of the time in different spheres of literature in order to bring the traditions of the study of Dostoyevsky and Tolstoi as writers and philosophers closer together.

¹⁴² Whom Solovyov later called “*a priori* and method personified” in *Plato’s Life Drama // Solovyov V. Politics, Law, and Morality* /Edited and translated by V.Wozniuk/ – New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000. – p. 215.

¹⁴³ Eco U. *The Role of the Reader. Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* – Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press, 1979. – p. 10.

the one hand, the contingent being of phenomena, the only thing accessible to us, the world of our experience, our knowledge; and on the other hand, being in itself, completely inaccessible to us and absolutely unknowable".¹⁴⁴ The author created "an enigma", to use Barthes's term, in the text and solved it by a pun "from Kant to Comte the human mind did not labor in vain".¹⁴⁵ In Russian this pun is emphasized by the similar transcription of names Kant [Kant] and Comte [Kont] in Cyrillic, and by the highly similar pronunciation of these names in Russian.

I elaborate the question on the set of functions of "the successor" of Kant, Fichte, who developed "the doctrine of the original synthetic unity of transcendental apperception (the act of self-knowledge is before experience)".¹⁴⁶ He has the function of a founding father and creator – "he created the system of pure subjective idealism, for the proposition "I am I" is for Fichte not only a formal principle of knowledge".¹⁴⁷

The function of a cultural hero – he rejected "the assumption of a *Ding an sich*". "The ghost" of it disappeared from the text for a period of time until it comes back with respect to Kant and in Schopenhauer "becomes completely known when it is determined as will".¹⁴⁸

All the above-mentioned functions can be called, according to Barthes's classification, cardinal or nuclear functions: they "play the role of the joints" in the text.¹⁴⁹ Let us see if there are some "catalyst-functions that fill the space between the points of alternative "control points" in the text".¹⁵⁰ Indeed, such functions can be found. For example, the function of Thomas Aquinas is only that of illustrating the philosophical trend of realism (within the broader story about the content of scholastic philosophy), and Solovyov condenses a story about it to a few words: the famous principle "*universalia sunt ante rem* (the *universal*, i.e. the concept, is *before the thing*, i.e. the particular)", and the conclusion that "genuine reality was attributed only to general concepts. According to the definition of Thomas

¹⁴⁴ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 56. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 44).

¹⁴⁵ Ibid. (Там же).

¹⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 39. (Там же. С. 28).

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 40. (Там же. С. 29).

¹⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 79. (Там же. ? 63).

¹⁴⁹ Barthes R. *Introduction à l'analyse structurale de récits* // *Communications*, 8 *L'analyse structurale du récit* – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – p. 14.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 15.

Aquinas, the absolute entity is an absolutely simple form, pure actuality without any potentiality”.¹⁵¹ The famous scholastic (Herbert Chesterton called him “the great liberator of reason”¹⁵²) “filled the cell of sense”¹⁵³ after Solovyov mentions that “the famous dispute between realism and nominalism is of some interest here”,¹⁵⁴ before he moves from Aquinas to nominalism.

The mention of “some of Hegel’s disciples (for instance, Rosenkranz)”¹⁵⁵ does not present an alternative possible development of the subject. First, he is one of several disciples that lowers his own status. Second, the proposition that “the local idea is *actualized* in nature and the human spirit” is written in Hegel’s style, as are expressions like “the idea passes into, emanates into nature or *posits* nature, so that the logical idea appears here in the form of the absolute spirit or God”.¹⁵⁶ Later this explanation is called “intrinsically absurd, for it involves the hypostasization of an abstract concept”.¹⁵⁷ Solovyov shows where Hegelian philosophy leads, if, like Rosenkranz, who appears to be just a victim of the Hegelian system, one tries to develop it further. It is rather a negative example of philosophizing in Hegel’s style, and Rosenkranz turns out to be “dead” from the perspective of development of the narrative, in Barthes’ words, just “fills the cell”, but plays the role of a sign of the author’s knowledge of second rate figures of Hegel’s school.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵¹ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 17 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 10).

¹⁵² Chesterton H. *Aquinas*, in the book Честертон Г.К. Вечный человек – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – С. 75.

¹⁵³ Barthes R. *Introduction à l’analyse structural de récits // Communications, 8 L’analyse structurale du récit* – Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – p. 7.

¹⁵⁴ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute / Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 17 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 10).

¹⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 110 (Там же. С. 89).

¹⁵⁶ Ibid. (Там же).

¹⁵⁷ Ibid. (Там же).

¹⁵⁸ Actually, Rosenkranz’s real place among Hegel’s pupils was quite significant, but not for Solovyov’s narrative. Copleston wrote about Rosenkranz: “As a pupil of both Schleiermacher and Hegel he tried to mediate between them in his development of the Hegelian system” (Copleston F. *A History of Philosophy*, in 9 vols., vol. 7 – New York: Image Books, 1985. – p. 246.).

To conclude this chapter, I want to point out that the logic of the novelistic narration in Chapters I-V of *The Crisis* follows the author's general critical attitude to European rationalism, but the personages of this narration are not limited by this scheme. This is one of the main principles of a novelistic narration: the personages are relatively free and play individual roles in the structure of the plot. They appear to be independent and autonomous, and their functions emphasize the strong points of their philosophies, rather than relating them to the philosophical context characterized by the crisis. Some of these personages look so individual that one can speak of a specific level of a personal relationship between the author and his personages, the very topic which I shall discuss in the next section.

2.6. Individual Portraits of Philosophers in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*

Principles of philosophical systems by themselves are always impersonal. In the history of philosophy, they become connected with names of the philosophers who propose them; hence these principles become more personal and recognizable. Moreover, in Solovyov's version of European philosophy, we find that Solovyov's attitude turns the philosophers into personalized characters. I call these "philosophical portraits" in the sense that the author of *The Crisis* has given several broad characteristics of individual philosophers, and undoubtedly, characters like Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer and von Hartmann drew the attention of the author far more than others.¹⁵⁹ The only sign of personality is the name of an author, if he is mentioned at all, and not replaced by the name of the trend he represents, such as nominalism or deism. For example, according to Solovyov, deism is "empty". That is why no French philosophers of the 18th century are even mentioned in *The Crisis*. Furthermore, Solovyov calls the time when materialism was a leading trend in public opinion and philosophic literature "a reign of wolves in philosophy".¹⁶⁰ The philosophical materialism of the 18th century is given such a clearly negative character-

¹⁵⁹ It is close to Lev Shaposhnikov's style of a philosophical portrait. See Шапошников Л.Е. Философские портреты – Н.Новгород, 1993. – С. 7. (L. Shaposhnikov *Philosophical Portraits*).

¹⁶⁰ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 177 Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 111). Here it does not have anything common with Wolff's philosophy. "The reign of wolves" is an image taken from folklore.

istic that there is no chance for rehabilitation in the text. Generally speaking, Solovyov does not write seriously about French materialism, and the philosophers of the Enlightenment rarely appear as personages in his works.¹⁶¹ He mentions Rousseau's influence on Kant only in *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*.¹⁶²

Solovyov concentrated on the German philosophical tradition paying attention to Hegel's philosophy in Chapters I and IV, and Schopenhauer's philosophy in Chapters I, II, and III. He creates a portrait of Schopenhauer in which his ideas are clearly represented. Solovyov selects his system of philosophy "both because of its originality (owing to which it cannot be subsumed under any general category) and because of the goal of the present inquiry, in which is epitomized the present instant of the philosophical consciousness, directly issued from Schopenhauer's doctrine".¹⁶³ Solovyov does not reduce Schopenhauer's system to the functional role of subject of his analysis, as happened to "the successor of Schopenhauer", Eduard von Hartmann, whose system Solovyov merely describes by seven theses about the unconscious.

On the one hand, this is a sign of attention and, to some extent, dependence, taking into account the remark of Lev Lopatin, that when Solovyov was young "Schopenhauer seized him totally as no one philosophical writer before or later".¹⁶⁴ On the other hand, it is a sign of a special attitude to the personage as a non-classic, a philosopher whose system can be challenged. There is a great similarity between the quotations from Schopenhauer and Solovyov's own manner of thought. For example, the author shares the main principle of Schopenhauer's philosophy to

¹⁶¹ Even in the paragraph where he writes directly about "an entire school of so-called empirical philosophy, which asserts a complete subordination of rational knowledge to external experience" (Ibid. p. 18 (Там же. С. 11)), Solovyov does not mention names, as though these are not worth mentioning.

¹⁶² Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 243. (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*).

¹⁶³ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 63 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 49).

¹⁶⁴ Лопатин Л.М. Памяти Вл. С. Соловьева // Книга о Владимире Соловьеве – М.: Советский писатель, 1991. – С. 111. (Lopatin L. *In Memory of V.I.S. Solovyov* // *A Book about Vladimir Solovyov*) There is another remark in Lopatin's article *Schopenhauer's Moral Doctrine* about "a charming influence of Schopenhauer's ethics" (Lopatin L. *Philosophical Characteristics and Speeches*).

such an extent that he starts to write using Schopenhauer's own words and in his style. He starts paragraphs in this Chapter by either an indirect quotation from Schopenhauer or his own thought, and the following statement is an example of how a philosophical position can be shared: "The external objective world as it immediately appears in our sensuous consciousness is our representation".¹⁶⁵ Then a quotation follows: "If I take away the thinking subject", Schopenhauer asserts, using Kant's words, "the whole corporeal world will disappear, since it is nothing else but a phenomenon in the sensuousness of our subject, a certain kind of representation of the subject".¹⁶⁶ The author of *The Crisis* accepts this Kantian-Schopenhauerian thesis. Nowhere earlier in *The Crisis* has the author agreed with his personage so quickly, and hastened to affirm his agreement. Here, Solovyov is doing precisely that: "This proposition is indisputably true, for it is self-evident that all that exists *for us* must be found in our consciousness, and it exists for us only insofar as we are conscious of it (an obvious tautology). The objective world immediately known to us is therefore only the world in our consciousness or our representation".¹⁶⁷

Furthermore, the author tries to think in Schopenhauer's style, starting from the proposition that "the world is a representation": he outlines a dialectic of "subject-object", denotes space and time as the forms of representation, and introduces "the law of causality". In the end, he comes to a complication of the original thesis: "the external sensuous world is a concrete representation produced by intuitive reason".¹⁶⁸ We can see that almost all Schopenhauerian concepts are represented in Solovyov's conclusion. And he does this as if from his own point of view. He shares Schopenhauer's criticism of materialism, and confirms his critical attitude by a quotation from Schopenhauer himself.¹⁶⁹ All this occurs when Solovyov has just expounded Schopenhauer's work *Über die vierfache Wurzel des Satzes vom zureichenden Grunde* (*On the Fourfold Root of the Law of Sufficient Ground*). We do not find the same attempt to come as close as possible to a

¹⁶⁵ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 63 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 49).

¹⁶⁶ Ibid. (Там же).

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 63 (Там же, С. 49–50).

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 69 (Там же. С. 54).

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 65 (Там же. С. 52). In the English edition, the German quotation is transferred to the Notes at the end of the book.

character's way of thinking when Solovyov describes the systems of Kant, Schelling, and Hegel, where there are, at first sight, certainly less opportunities for systematic discourse. So, the examples of the imitation of Schopenhauer's style by Solovyov and almost uncritical acceptance of Schopenhauerian postulates are signs of Solovyov's personal affection for him.

In his second description of Schopenhauerian philosophy, the author is more critical. In Chapters II and III, Solovyov emphasizes the work *Welt as Wille und Vorstellung* (*The World as Will and Representation*), and here many quotations from this work, sharp critical remarks, indications of failure, misunderstanding, alogism, double-sense, nonsense, and hypostasizations of abstract principles can be found. We also find conclusions which are not very flattering for Schopenhauer, namely, that "he *personifies* his metaphysical will and makes it into an acting and suffering subject;"¹⁷⁰ "the expression the "will suffers" (unless it is taken figuratively) is completely absurd;"¹⁷¹ "no individuality (and consequently this goes for the person too) has independence; every individuality is only a phenomenon or appearance of the will to life".¹⁷² Losev even thought that Solovyov "accused Schopenhauer of nothing less than absolute nihilism", bearing in mind Solovyov's description of the result of Schopenhauer's philosophy: "If there is no will, there is no representation, no world. For us there remains only nothing, of course".¹⁷³

However, when he writes that "his affirmation of will as the fundamental principle, and the union of ethics and metaphysics which proceeds from it, signify, as we shall see, a complete reversal in the course of Western philosophy",¹⁷⁴ Solovyov attributes to Schopenhauer the function of a cultural hero. This specific attitude to Schopenhauer can be explained, to some extent, by his role in the revival of the religious world-view.¹⁷⁵ This

¹⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 98 (Там же. С. 79).

¹⁷¹ Ibid. p. 100 (Там же. С. 81).

¹⁷² Ibid. p. 101 (Там же. С. 82).

¹⁷³ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 202. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

¹⁷⁴ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ — Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. — p. 86 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 69).

¹⁷⁵ As Lopatin writes: "In Schopenhauer's philosophy he has found a satisfaction of religious requirement, that never ceased in him, the religious understanding and religious attitude towards life. The view on life as a moral purifying process

concealed religiosity of Schopenhauer's philosophy became the reason for Solovyov's finding there the signs of a new synthesis of science, religion and philosophy on the basis, in Schopenhauer's case, of a Buddhist worldview and an identification of the world with nothing. This pathos was very close to that of Solovyov, and his last and most poetic metaphor in *The Crisis* is the philosophy that "extends the hand to religion". I will discuss this metaphor in section 2.12.

In the case of Hegel, Solovyov gives the general outline of his philosophy in Chapter 1, and then refers the reader to the works of Nikita Gilyarov-Platonov. In Chapter 4, the author gives a number of important quotations (that are clearly indicated as Hegelian, although printing traditions and norms of the 1870s did not make it so clear as it is in the modern English edition I quote here). He always mentions Hegel's name, so one can never confuse any of Hegel's thoughts with the author's own vision, contrary to what happens with Schopenhauer in Chapter I. The author "returns to Hegel" at the beginning of Chapter IV, so, in fact, his philosophy is expounded twice (Schopenhauer's thoughts are analyzed three times in *The Crisis*, in different places), and the second analysis of Hegel's philosophy is needed to show how it "concluded philosophical rationalism and expressed it in all its exclusiveness (and thus making its limitations obvious)".¹⁷⁶ This has an explanatory purpose, and certainly the fact that Hegel's system has been selected as an example of the unsatisfactory result of Western philosophy, which leads to the crisis, speaks for

was the most attractive for Solovyov in Schopenhauer, the view that was realized in a style of speculative Buddhism" (Лопатин Л.М. *Философские характеристики и речи* – М.: Academia, 1995. – С. 111 (Lopatin L. *Philosophic Characterizations and speeches*)). In Russian original: "У Шопенгауэра он нашел ... удовлетворение никогда не умолкавшей в нем религиозной потребности, религиозное понимание и религиозное отношение к жизни. В Шопенгауэре его более всего привлекало воззрение на жизнь как на нравственный очистительный процесс, воззрение строго проведенное в стиле умозрительного буддизма". Yevgeny Trubetskoi wrote about this interesting parallel between Schopenhauer and Solovyov: "The thought that the goal of life is a destruction of the all surrounding world he could get from the philosophy of Schopenhauer only, from it he could acquire a corresponding way of thinking". (Трубецкой Е.Н. *Мирозерцание Владимира Соловьёва*, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Медиум, 1995. – С. 401 (Trubetskoi Y. *Vladimir Solovyov's World-View*, in 2 vols., vol.2).

¹⁷⁶Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 104 (Соловьёв В.С. *Сочинения* в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 84).

itself. Another point, not directly related to my purpose, is Solovyov's critique of Hegel's impracticality and self-contradiction.¹⁷⁷

Regarding Schelling, one finds the same treatment as in the case of Schopenhauer: the author's voice and quotations from Schelling are sometimes mixed. But Schelling's philosophy is described only once. A close friend of Solovyov, Yevgeny Trubetskoi, pointed it out in his major work on Solovyov and called *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* "the Russian modification of Schellingian thought".¹⁷⁸ In Solovyoviana, the question of the dependence of Solovyov's philosophy on Schelling has received considerable attention,¹⁷⁹ but all works on this theme limit themselves to a general dependence.¹⁸⁰ It is time to clarify this with respect to each of Solovyov's works. I will try to do this for *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*.

It is obvious that, in Solovyov's opinion, Schellingian and German classical philosophy as a whole belong to the past, as well as to the Christian tradition (Protestantism). Losev has already stated this, and Lazarev

¹⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 112 (Там же. С. 92).

¹⁷⁸ Трубецкой Е.Н. Мирозерцание Владимира Соловьева, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Медиум, 1995. – С. 53 (Trubetskoi Y. *Vladimir Solovyov's World-View*, in 2 vols., vol.2).

¹⁷⁹ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 192–194. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*); *Философия Шеллинга в России* /под редакцией В. Пустарнакова/ – СПб.: Издательство Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 1998. – С. 477–499 (*Schelling's Philosophy in Russia* /Edited by V.Pustarnakov/). The author of the article about Solovyov, V. Lazarev sticks to the position that "Solovyov used Schellingian notions and put into circulation typically Schellingian philosophical concepts; his principle and methodology is also very similar to Schelling: intellectual (in the case of Solovyov has "an ideal") intuition, method of evolution from the elementary "cell" to internally divided and combined wholeness, inclination to paradoxes and solving them in an organic unity which is developed to the All-unity, the theosophical nature of mental constructions At the same time, the thinking of both philosophers of the highest rank goes in different directions, each goes his own way regardless of all influences, and even in spite of them". (Лазарев В.В. *Философия Соловьева и Шеллинг* // *Философия Шеллинга в России* /под редакцией В. Пустарнакова/ – СПб.: Издательство Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 1998. – С.481 (Lazarev V. *Solovyov's Philosophy and Schelling* // *Schelling's Philosophy in Russia* /Edited by V.Pustarnakov/, p. 481)).

¹⁸⁰ Paul Valliere mentions *The Crisis* in his article and states that "Solovyov discusses Schelling, but only the *Identitätsphilosophie*, and that merely a transitional phase of the idealist movement that ends with Hegel". See Valliere P. *Solov'ev and Schelling's Philosophy of Revelation* // Bercken W. van den, de Courten M., van der Zweerde E. *Vladimir Solov'ev: Reconciler and Polemicist. Selected Papers of the International Vladimir Solov'ev Conference held at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in September 1998* – Leuven: Peeters, 2000. – p. 119.

repeats it.¹⁸¹ Taking into account all the problems of Russian philosophic development in the 19th century, it was unprecedented for Russian professionals in philosophy (and Solovyov was one of them in 1874) to reflect on a Protestant philosophic tradition, and to try to find there something useful for Orthodox or Russian thought.¹⁸²

To some extent, it can be taken as a rule that if a German classic philosopher is mentioned less in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. It means that for Solovyov, he is less responsible for the crisis of that time. The general subject and pathos of Solovyov's narrative is critical. That is why the common evaluation, based on the number of quotations and textual parallels has to be reversed in case of *The Crisis*. Notably less attention is given to Schelling than to other classical philosophers in Chapter I, where Solovyov describes German idealism in general. And Solovyov's final statement in *The Crisis* is rather Schellingian. He emphasizes "the complete manifestation of the all-one" and the fact that philosophy "extends its hand to religion". So, at least from the point of view of his concluding statements, Solovyov depends on Schellingian approach in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*.

2.7. The Rhetorical Figure of Parallelism and Comparison in History of Philosophy¹⁸³

The history of European thought is represented in *The Crisis* as a sequence of different statements by different philosophers. They comple-

¹⁸¹ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 194. (Losev A. Vladimir Solovyov and his Time); Лазарев В.В. Философия Соловьева и Шеллинг // Философия Шеллинга в России /под редакцией В. Пустарнакова/ — СПб.: Издательство Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 1998. — С.479. (Lazarev V. *Solovyov's Philosophy and Schelling* // *The Philosophy of Schelling in Russia*, p. 479).

¹⁸² Schelling's philosophy was studied and taught at the Russian universities in the 1860s — 1870s, but, as V.Pustarnakov pointed out, "Schelling was not accepted well because he was preferred to other philosophical authorities — either to Kant or Hegel". Besides, the leading academic philosophers, Troitsky, Vladislavlev, and Yurkevich, severely criticized Schelling from different positions. Философия Шеллинга в России /под редакцией В. Пустарнакова/ — СПб.: Издательство Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 1998. — С. 146—148. (*The Philosophy of Schelling in Russia* /Edited. by V.Pustarnakov/).

¹⁸³ Here I have taken some terms from classical rhetorics, and parallelism is one of the basic rhetorical figures. Nowadays, they are considered elements of discourse analysis. See Gray B. *The Grammatical Foundation of Rhetoric. Discourse Analysis* — The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1977. — pp.23—29, 99—109.

ment each other, and the process continues right up to the crisis. The author offers a way out of that crisis in the form of a synthesis of science, philosophy, and religion. He follows the chronological order of the appearance of different characters in the narrative. At one point he introduces a gap in philosophic development, when several centuries – the period of Renaissance – turn out to be pointless.¹⁸⁴ The author mostly uses the figure of parallelism (“thematic parallelism”, to borrow Boris Tomashevsky’s term¹⁸⁵) in the development of philosophy. The first case of this in *The Crisis* is a parallel traced back, by the author, between the development of early scholasticism and the rationalism of modern times.¹⁸⁶ In the relevant long passage we find many examples of philosophical poetic eloquence. Of course, the theme of this paragraph was well known to the audience at the university, and to the readers of books like *The Crisis*. Actually, Solovyov did not introduce anything completely new, but the parallels given in this description of the development of European philosophy between the stages

¹⁸⁴ The feature of philosophic space in the narrative is an opportunity to move to any direction (as in a literary narrative of a novel) because a certain period of development, allegedly, did not give rise to any original thought. This happened in the Renaissance. Of course, Solovyov did not deny the significance of this epoch, but regarding *The Crisis* and contribution of the Renaissance the crisis of modern Western philosophy, it did not contribute anything significant. For Solovyov’s concept of European philosophy it was not important, and we have to accept his point of view when we analyze *The Crisis*.

¹⁸⁵ Томашевский Б.В. Теория литературы. Поэтика – М.: Аспект Пресс, 1996. – С. 234. (Tomashevsky B. *Theory of Literature. Poetics*).

¹⁸⁶ “A dualism lies at the beginning of modern philosophy as well, this time not between reason and faith, but between reason and nature, the external world, the object of reason. Reason, asserted as an independent principle in medieval philosophy, necessarily had to be victorious over authority. At the very beginning of the conflict, confidence in this victory had already been expressed by John Scotus Erigena, the first medieval thinker. On the other hand, in modern philosophy, reason, as an independent principle, had to engulf its object – i.e., the external world, nature – to liken this object to itself. Confidence in the dominance of reason over the external object was already clearly expressed by Descartes, the first representative of modern philosophy. Just as for Erigena authority becomes meaningful only when it is confirmed by reason (which, by contrast, does only require any confirmation from authority), so for Descartes the external world can be recognized as having genuine reality only when such a reality is demanded by reason. The truth of reason does not depend on any external confirmation; rather reason itself contains within itself the whole basis of its truth – *cogito, ergo sum*”. Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* /Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 – p. 86 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 69).

of scholasticism and modern rationalism are very impressive indeed. This impressive quality derives from several comparisons and emphases of similarities. The parallel starts by the statement: “a dualism lies at the beginning of modern philosophy as well”. It indicates a dual character in the history of philosophical ideas, making the binary oppositions “reason and faith”, or “reason and nature” the key principles of philosophic development. The main characters arrange themselves according to this principle of binary opposition. Erigena is the first “thinker”, Descartes “the first representative of modern philosophy”. Erigena’s main idea is “to express confidence” in the victory of reason over authority, and Descartes’s function in the text is similar. He also “expressed confidence” in the dominance of reason. Here we can see the start of the main subject of *The Crisis* (the division between reason and faith), which is finished at the end of the narrative by the completion of the circle, as philosophy extends its hand to religion. And the tension in the relationship between two main concepts in the “space of thought” will be preserved until the end of *The Crisis*. In this “space of thought” there are specific rules, or rather, from the point of view of an outside observer, there is a lack of rules; significant historical periods are not worth mentioning, and as a result, the sequence of epochs is not kept in formal chronological order. Two thinkers of different centuries can be represented in dialogue as if they lived simultaneously.

A parallelism of situations in the space of philosophy can be found several times in *The Crisis*. I have already mentioned the syllogism in Chapter V which helps to describe (schematically) the development of rationalism and empiricism (section 2.2). But the author already prepares for the introduction of this of parallelism in Chapter I: “Materialism thereby passes over into positivism. Here an obvious parallel emerges: just as the rationalist realism of Wolff’s philosophy necessarily led to Kant’s rationalist criticism, so the empirical realism of the materialists necessarily led to August Comte’s empirical criticism”.¹⁸⁷ In the last sentence of this parallel construction, the author develops this figure into a general conclusion, where philosophic realism is characterized as “absurdity” and, probably to mask the strong expression, the author ends the quotation effectively with a Greek expression.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 54 (Там же. С. 42).

¹⁸⁸ “For all realism, i.e. all acknowledgment of independent reality behind the external object of reason (be it an object of reason or a sensuous empirical object), is, in its essence, meaningless and an absurdity (*katexochen*). (Ibid. p. 55 (Там же. С. 42)).

Solovyov also states the parallelism between the systems of Hegel and Comte, between Hegel's "purely logical and *a priori* philosophy" and Comte's empiricism.¹⁸⁹ The foundation of this parallel figure and comparison of two systems is their claims to universality and "absoluteness".¹⁹⁰

There is also an element of parallelism (or rather a comparison) between two of Solovyov's favorite philosophers, Schopenhauer and Spinoza.¹⁹¹ "In Schopenhauer separate individuals have the same relation to the universal will as individual modes have to substance in Spinoza".¹⁹² The comparison is rather a parody, which does not provide the reader

¹⁸⁹ According to Solovyov, "there is a more intimate and inner connection between Hegel's philosophy and materialism", and the parallel is based on this intimate link.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid. p. 51 (Там же. С. 39) It is known that Solovyov was severely criticized by the positivists (Vladimir Lesevich, Michail Vladislavlev and Nikolai Strakhov) for the underestimation of differences between trends in positive philosophy (Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 31. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*)) Now we can make a distinction between the places where the author actually does not acknowledge this difference, and speaks about positivism as a trend, and where he analyzes Comte's philosophy very carefully, and the place where he is just seized by the development of the cyclic plot of the narrative, and wishes to describe it as a cycle. Certainly, the positivists knew the details of positive philosophy better than Solovyov, who mostly studied "Greek theologians and German philosophers" for his dissertation. But Solovyov has a serious excuse for not wishing to go deeper into details of positivist doctrine, for not reading the works of Vladimir Lesevich and Grigory Wyruboff (Solovyov recognized during the dispute that he did not know Wyruboff); the purpose of his dissertation was different, namely, "to demonstrate that previous philosophical development has bequeathed to the very near future a complete and universal resolution of those questions which were resolved one-sidedly and therefore unsatisfactorily in the course of that development". It is a messianic task in the Slavophile style (and A. Walicki has written on this in *The Slavophile Controversy*, p. 560), or an artistic task, rather than a clarification of August Comte's and his followers' postulates which Lesevich tried to thrust on Solovyov. On Vladimir, Lesevich see Walicki A. *A History of Russian Thought. From the Enlightenment to Marxism* — Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980 — pp. 353–356.

¹⁹¹ In his late work *The Concept of God (Defending Spinoza's Philosophy)*, 1897, Solovyov confessed that Spinoza was his "first love in the sphere of philosophy" (Соловьев В.С. Понятие о Боге. (В защиту философии Спинозы) // Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 10-и т., Т. 9 — Брюссель: Жизнь с Богом, 1966. — С. 3).

¹⁹² Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ — Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 — p. 101 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 82).

with any new knowledge, but emphasizes again that Schopenhauer often confuses the impersonal World Will and the wills of individuals.¹⁹³

There is, further, a common foundation for comparison between the “abstract spiritualism” in the rationalistic tendency, and the materialism of the empirical tendency, namely “an immaturity of thought”.¹⁹⁴ Solovoyv gives an example of this immaturity that “one can find in Descartes or in Wolff”, namely, that “to the first principle that they compose is attributed an autonomous existence independent of our thought, in the form of absolute substance, the supreme monad, the receptacle of all reality (*Inbegriff aller Realität*), etc”. In the case of materialism “its essence consists in the fact that, on the one hand, something empirically given (matter) is taken as the real first principle. But since the purely empirical significance of this given is not yet consciously assimilated, on the other hand, this empirical matter has ascribed to it the significance of an absolute and universal essence, which already transcends the bounds of the empirical, which has to do only with the given particular reality and by no means with universal essence”.¹⁹⁵ As a result, the author ends the development of this comparison with an excellent metaphor: “Materialism may justly be called *the unconscious metaphysics of empiricism*”.¹⁹⁶ This is a clear example of how a metaphor can be developed in a philosophical text.

Solovoyv found a common act of “betrayal” (even the choice of words speaks for itself) in both these trends of thought: “abstract spiritualism thus unconsciously betrays the rationalist principle”,¹⁹⁷ and “then materialism betrays the empirical principle”. Here, the author exceeds the bounds of comparisons in philosophy. Vladislavlev rightly criticized him for this during the dispute, and afterwards in the press.¹⁹⁸

The function of von Hartmann as a cultural hero is connected with the parallelism of situations: “a new philosophical development” was started both by Kant and by “the philosophy of the unconscious” as well. The

¹⁹³ Spinoza (who was at some time the favorite philosopher of Solovoyv, as Lopatin states) plays the role of an authority in this episode, and Solovoyv refers to him by the rhetorical question: “But how can a transient phenomenon negate its eternal essence? What would Spinoza have said about a mode that destroys the substance?” (Ibid. p. 101 (Там же. С. 82)).

¹⁹⁴ Ibid. p. 136. (Там же. С. 110–111).

¹⁹⁵ Ibid. (Там же).

¹⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 137. (Там же. С. 111).

¹⁹⁷ Ibid. (Там же).

¹⁹⁸ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 31. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovoyv and his Time*).

author was trying to promote von Hartmann's philosophy so zealously, because he could see a turn towards a religious vision only in Schopenhauer's and von Hartmann's philosophy. It was necessary for his conception of the Crisis, and for a way out by means of a religious world-view. Vladislavlev made an effort to moderate this eulogy. For the logic of the plot it was important for Solovyov to return to Kant and trace back "the development of Western philosophy from Kant to Schopenhauer".¹⁹⁹

All these parallelisms and comparisons play a cohesive role in the narrative, helping the author to move quickly from one point in the story to another, especially if these comparisons emphasize the similarity of problems the philosophers of different epochs dealt with, as in the case of Erigena and Descartes, or Spinoza and Schopenhauer. Generally speaking, they do not bring any new information, because they present a part of the well-known history of philosophy; but the clear parallels between different philosophers bring new knowledge, in the sense that the relationship between participants of the philosophical process becomes clearer, and these rhetorical devices make the narrative more impressive. In the next chapter, I will deal with other devices that make the text more cohesive.

2.8. Forms of Narrative and Points of View in *The Crisis*

I will use several traditional categories of narrative analysis based on the works of Barthes already mentioned, and, in part, on Boris Uspensky's work.²⁰⁰ In an academic dissertation like *The Crisis*, the descriptive narrative is prevalent and the author's voice dominant, even if it does not demonstrate its dominance by first-person singular grammatical forms. The trouble is, to some extent, connected with the academic tradition which prescribes the usage of impersonal constructions like "we", or "us", and recommends careful usage of forms "I" and "me". That is why there are not many indications of the author's voice in *The Crisis*; still there are episodes in the text where the author articulates his central ideas.

There are two ways of introducing important thoughts to the text of *The Crisis*. The first one is an *impersonal narration*. It can be characterized by

¹⁹⁹ Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 4. In the English edition of *The Crisis* this element of "The Content" is missed for some reason.

²⁰⁰ Успенский Б.А. Поэтика композиции. Структура художественного текста и типология композиционных форм – М.: Искусство, 1973. – С. 13–193. (Uspensky B. *Poetics of Composition. The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of Forms of Composition*).

the usage of impersonal grammatical constructions. We can see this kind of narrative everywhere in *The Crisis*, and it corresponds to the dominant academic style of any dissertation. I am particularly interested in the occasions where the author invites the reader to share his opinion or truth. This happens mostly when the author uses the impersonal (or first person plural) construction: “we have”, “we know”, “we mean”, “we find that which actually exists”, “we are conscious of ourselves”, which we find quite frequently in the text. It contradicts the author’s statement at the beginning of the Introduction, that “the subject of philosophy is preeminently the singular I, as a knower”.²⁰¹ Nor is it a sign of the author’s modesty, or of his wish to mask his presence, because we also find many phrases like: “I hope”, “I noticed”, “I proved” “I clearly do not relate”, etc. Whence this polysemy? There are at least two forms of the author’s narration.

The second one, and one we see more often in *The Crisis*, is a *personalized narration* in the presence of (1) *the Author-Describer* who tells the story from his own point of view, while he describes some idea or theory. But we also see (2) the author who pronounces his own opinions, which are, in turn, based on collective authority, or just on common sense (he may be called *the Author-Orator*, “the author as personality”, or “the image of the author”).

This mysterious figure of the “Author-Orator” appears first in the second paragraph of the Introduction: “Turning, finally, to artistic creativity, we find that, although its subject is undoubtedly the person of the artist”.²⁰² The word “undoubtedly” is a sign of impersonal authority.²⁰³ Impersonal conclusions, and thoughts of the Author-Describer which follow take up a long part of the text. At the beginning of Chapter II, the figure of the Author-Orator reappears: “As we have seen, the world of phenomena, in which we live and move, is determined by the general forms of space, time and causality”.²⁰⁴ First of all, the narration here is

²⁰¹ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 – p. 12. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 6).

²⁰² Ibid. (Там же).

²⁰³ It is interesting that Solovyov himself made a footnote in the text that “according to the astonishing presuppositions of some spiritualists, the works of artistic genius are actually produced by the spirits of the dead, who inspire the artist” (Ibid. p.169. (Там же. С. 6)). It proves that the form “we find” is just the sign of authority of the majority, or a requirement of the common sense.

²⁰⁴ Ibid. P. 70 (Там же, S. 55).

more lively and energetic. The author has completed the description of history of European philosophy “from scholasticism to Kant”, and turned to his favorite philosopher, in this context, Schopenhauer. He is trying to involve the reader in the details of Schopenhauerian philosophy by using constructions like “we live and move”, “we see”, etc. Secondly, it is not very clear whether this is the author’s interpretation of Schopenhauer, or his own opinion. It looks like a discourse in the style of Schopenhauer, who also sometimes mixed narrative from his personal point of view, with impersonal narrative using “we”. Solovyov indicates this link between reader and the author especially when he claims to have discovered some indisputable truths and comes to clear conclusions, for example: “if, like other objects, human beings were accessible to us only from outside, by means of reason with its general forms, they would seem to us a perfect miracle. But this miracle is we ourselves, and, thus, precisely here, where the forms of representation are totally insufficient means of understanding, another source of inner and immediate knowledge is revealed to us”.²⁰⁵ The author gets so involved in this discourse in the style of Schopenhauer that he once even removes all his masks in the sentence: “I want to raise my hand and I do”.²⁰⁶ This happens when he is trying to prove that a movement of the arm is at once both representation and act of will.

As we see, the author’s point of view dominates because of the requirements of dissertations, requirements of a social and extra-textual, rather than a textual character; yet in some cases the author overcomes this imperative of academic style. Of course, it is not a “play” with points of view, as we find in Lev Tolstoi’s *War and Peace* of almost the same time.²⁰⁷ But behind the dominant “objectivity” of Solovyov’s narrative, we do see several personal remarks, as above, and sometimes “other voices”.

2.9. The Positivists in *The Crisis*

With the term “positivism” the author denotes a group of theories he does not like, and does not want to differentiate, apart from his consideration of Comte, to whom Solovyov devotes *The Appendix. August Comte’s*

²⁰⁵ Ibid. p. 74 (Там же. С. 58).

²⁰⁶ Ibid. (Там же).

²⁰⁷ Boris Uspensky described this in his book about poetics of composition (See: Uspensky B. *Poetics of Composition. The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of Forms of the Composition*. (Успенский Б.А. Поэтика композиции. Структура художественного текста и типология композиционных форм — М.: Искусство, 1973. — С. 9—213)).

Theory of the Three Phases in the Intellectual Development of Humankind. Solovyov was criticized for his confusion of different positivists theories. The subtitle *Against the Positivists* emphasizes the author's opposition to a group of people who share a scientific world-view and, to some extent, the whole scientific community. It is not always clear against whom the author has aimed his critical weapon, although it is clear that, generally speaking, Solovyov makes a distinction between Comte, Mill, Spencer, on the one hand, and their followers and adherents in Russia, on the other. Some of the latter were his official opponents, or could occasionally take the floor in dispute, and Solovyov deliberately offended them when he remarked that he did not know of a writer such as Wyruboff.²⁰⁸

The author characterizes positivism from the beginning as "so-called",²⁰⁹ and the "self-satisfied certainty" with which it is endowed seems to the author to be "extremely limited and unjustified".²¹⁰ After this

²⁰⁸ Лукьянов С.М. О Вл. С. Соловьеве в его молодые годы, в 3-х т., Т. 1. М.: Книга, 1990. — С. 432. (Lukyanov S. *On Vl. Solovyov in his Youth*) On Grigory Wyruboff (1843–1913) whom, because he was active mainly in France, Solovyov did not know, see: Walicki A. *A History of Russian Thought. From the Enlightenment to Marxism* — Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980. — pp. 351–353. As a university lecturer in the 1870s–1880s, Solovyov did not have problems with students who were at that time mostly adherents of positive philosophy. There are remarks of N. Nikiforov, the follower of Lev Tolstoi, about Solovyov's popularity among students (Никифоров Н.К. Петербургское студенчество и Влад. Соловьев // Книга о Владимире Соловьеве — М.: Советский писатель, 1991. — С. 165 — 189) and the remark of prince E. Ukhtomsky that "Solovyov did not get out of ovations as a lecturer". (Из разговоров С.М. Лукьянова с Э.Э. Ухтомским 30.05.1920 (Материалы к биографии Вл. Соловьева. Из архива С.М. Лукьянова) // Российский архив, II, III, 1992. — С. 396. (*Materials for Biography of Vl. Solovyov (From the Archive of Sergei Lukyanov), Records of S. Lukyanov's Talks to E. Ukhtomsky*) // *Russian Archive*, II, III, 1992)). A. Kozyrev mentions a letter of B. Markovich to M. Katayev in 1882, where Markovich writes: "Vlad. Solovyov has gone from here (St. Petersburg, I.S.) to Moscow and, to the students common sorrow, has interrupted his course of lectures at the university". See: Козырев А. Наукоучение Владимира Соловьева: К истории неудавшегося замысла // Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1997 г. / Отв. Редактор Колеров М. / — СПб.: Алетейя, 1997. — С. 12 (Kozyrev A. *Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy of Science: History of an Unsuccessful Project* // *Research on History of Russian Thought*. Year-book 1997.

²⁰⁹ Twice, on pages 11 and 153.

²¹⁰ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ — Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. — pp. 11–12 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 5). The author has the conviction that his view "differs from the usual negative attitude toward philosophy, the systematic expression of which we find in so-called *positivism*".

introduction, positivism is represented as a kind of anti-philosophy. This opposition of *one's own*, versus *the alien (positivist)*, can be traced through the whole text of *The Crisis*. The positivists have their own terminology. For example, they call metaphysics “the speculative current in philosophy”. They call the development of philosophy (as an author’s profession) “fruitless”. Results of modern developments as “the human mind has come to the negative result of positivism” correlate with the 18th century “dogmatic dream” stirred up by Kant. The author is not satisfied with “the concluded philosophic development” and hopes for “a complete and universal resolution of those questions which were resolved one-sidedly”.²¹¹ The author recruits the reader as his ally in a journey through the “space” of philosophy. The reader should be sure that philosophy has not finished since there is a need for a new stage in its development which goes beyond philosophy (this is a reason to read the work through to the end). So far, since the reader has already opened the book, one should not call philosophy “fruitless” *a priori*, and can be persuaded of its fruitfulness within the limits of the philosophic narrative. In this case, the characteristic of positivism as “self-satisfied” is very helpful for the author in shaping the reader’s opinion, and generating his desire to read the book.

At the end of the Introduction, when the reader has presumably already forgotten about the dramatic tension of the opening, and the need to resist the claims of positivism, the author suddenly expresses his solidarity with an imaginary positivist rival, saying that “this result of modern philosophy, negating all metaphysics as impossible, apparently confirms the view of positivism”.²¹² This results from the cycle of development as the narrative comes back to the starting point of the opposition “*positivism* versus *metaphysics*” (i.e. philosophy). The Introduction is finished at this point, and here the author makes the logical transition to the part describing the current crisis in philosophy.

The voice of the first positivist appears in the text at the end of the dissertation, in the *Appendix*, where the positivist pretension to the universality is criticized.²¹³ From the beginning there is a sign that positivism (as the author interprets it) has a very weak basis.²¹⁴ And moreover we

²¹¹ Ibid. p. 12. (Там же. С.5).

²¹² Ibid. p. 33 (Там же. С. 24).

²¹³ “French positivism’s pretension to universality is greater than that of any other system”. (Ibid. p. 151 (Там же. С. 122)).

²¹⁴ “I must therefore examine this supposed law, especially since, as we have seen, it constitutes the main, if not the sole, basis of Comte’s whole system of positivism, which stands or falls with it”. (Ibid. (Там же)).

find a clear illustration of how this space of thought is represented on the pages of *The Crisis*. Solovyov speaks about Comte's doctrine as though Comte deliberately refuted the idea of synthesis (this was one of the key ideas in Solovyov's dissertation), and speaks as vividly as if Comte could foresee Solovyov's attempt thirty years before.²¹⁵

Finally, we come across a very important rhetorical device – a comparison which rejects all pretensions of the positivist (empiricist) school by means of just a mere historical analogy. This comparison puts together two doctrines which are or pretend to be universal, viz. positivism and papism: “French positivism's pretension to universality is greater than that of any other system. Its representatives were convinced that positivism must become the universal world-view for the entire civilized world, must become that which papism was in the Middle Ages”.²¹⁶ In this context, the author also uses a few ironic phrases, at which I will look in the following section.

2.10. Anti-positivistic Irony in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*²¹⁷

Several ironic remarks in *The Crisis* can be highlighted briefly as initial examples of Solovyov's *publicistika*-style which was fully realized in his later works in the period when he was a freelance writer. The irony in Solovyov's academic texts helps him to realize the original intention expressed in the subtitle – *Against the Positivists*.

The first ironic attack starts when, after Comte's introduction of the concept of “the intellectual and moral *functions of the brain*”, Solovyov

²¹⁵ “Theology and metaphysics are recognized as only preliminary, transitional stages. It is clear that this implicitly negates the possibility of the synthesis affirmed by me”. (Ibid. p. 150 (Там же. С. 122)).

²¹⁶ Ibid. (Там же) It is becoming clearer that Solovyov's comparison of positivism and papism was very ironic, especially, if we take into account that the audience (students) was mostly indifferent to religion, if not atheist or nihilist.

²¹⁷ The nature of irony is characterized by Martin as a device which “convey two messages through one code” (Martin W. *Recent Theories of Narrative* – Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986. – p. 179) and by Boris Uspensky as “non-coincidence of the author's and the reader's points of view, when this non-coincidence is a part of the authors' plan”. Uspensky B. *Poetics of Composition. The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of Forms of the Composition*. (Успенский Б.А. Поэтика композиции. Структура художественного текста и типология композиционных форм – М.: Искусство, 1973. – С. 161). About the nature of Irony see also “The Introduction” of Handwerk G. *Irony and Ethics in Narrative. From Schlegel to Lacan* – New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1954. – pp. 1–17.

notes: “Thus, the brain is also the subject of every consciousness, and at the same time that very same brain is one of the phenomena in consciousness. That is, it is one of the products of its own function”.²¹⁸ Here the irony is a reduction to nonsense (*reductio ad absurdum*) as an argumentative move as well as a rhetorical one.

The second example of irony comes through oxymoron:²¹⁹ “In fact, strange to say, positivists do admit a certain knowability of the absolutely unknowable”.²²⁰ This helps to realize the key-metaphor of Solovyov’s criticism of the positivism, namely “one-sidedness of positivism itself”.

The third example of irony can be found when the author purposefully tires the reader with long quotations from *Course de philosophie positive* by Comte. The author gives his hero (Comte in this case) the opportunity to express his point of view on three pages, and after that draws the tired reader to his own side by a single phrase: “Thus, here are those great principles which must create the new world!” The exclamation mark at the end is a sign of the author’s irony: Solovyov clearly indicates that the theorist of positive knowledge posits unattainable purposes. The irony here takes the shape of hyperbolization of Comte’s pretensions: Comte’s phrase “Positive philosophy can serve as the unique solid foundation for social reorganization, which must end the state of crisis in which the most civilized nations have found themselves for such a long time” is interpreted by Solovyov as a wish to “create the new world”, which is in fact a hyperbolic exaggeration.

Another ironic attack is connected with a quick substitution of concepts and an appeal to the Christian faith of the reader²²¹ (for the Orthodox reader of the 19th century Comte’s thesis sounded like blasphemy): “Comte asserts that Christ was *only* a political adventurer and, on the basis of the fact that Protestantism has a negative attitude towards the externalities of

²¹⁸Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 55. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 43).

²¹⁹ “The figure that combines contradictory elements within a single expression”. (Burke K. *A Rhetoric of Motives* – Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1950. – p.324.

²²⁰ Solovyov V. *The Crisis*, p. 57 (Там же. С. 45).

²²¹ The university audience (the listeners) was predominantly indifferent to religion, but they grew up in the Orthodox tradition like Solovyov himself and the potential audience of readers was likely more favorable to religious motives than the university public.

cult, Comte assures us that it is only a reproduction of Mohammedanism”.²²²

There is, finally, also an ironic remark against John Mill. The author first mentions Mill's general thesis: “Monotheism is in greater accord with the positive type of thought, and the transition from polytheism to monotheism (i.e., more precisely, to Christianity), was chiefly conditioned by the development of positive knowledge”.²²³ The author has given his hero the space to express his opinion with a long quotation and, shortly after this, reduces his point to absurdity by means of a hypothetical example from world history: “In order to be consistent, Mill should have asserted that the semibarbaric tribes of Arabia and Mauritania that adopted Mohammed's monotheism, were prepared for this by the development of positive knowledge among them”.²²⁴

2.11. The Permanent Motif in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*²²⁵

The motif of “*Ding an sich*” appears in Chapter I as “completely inaccessible to knowledge”.²²⁶ It is, for us, a pure X. Later, in a very

²²² Ibid. p. 158 (Там же. С. 130) It is interesting to notice that later, in the article *The Idea of Mankind in August Comte*, Solovyov writes “The great merit of the atheist and non-Christian Comte for the modern Christian world is not limited to his making strong point in his “positive religion” in favor of Divine Humanity, oblivion to which was so harmful to the right development of Christian consciousness. Beside this, by defining the content of activity of *Le Grand Ktre*, Comte has come very closely – closer than many believers – to another, final truth of Christianity”. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 579. (Solovyov V. *The Idea of Humanity in August Comte // Works*, in 2 vol.)) So, on the one hand, the name of the non-Christian in the 19th century Russian language resounded with strongly negative characteristics (especially the Russian expression “nechrist”, a kind of a pejorative name for a non-Christian). On the other hand, Solovyov thought that Comte underlined and developed the ideas that were forgotten in the world of believers in his time, and eventually did that for the benefit of Christianity. Mentioning this and creating a figure of contrast in the text, Solovyov rather extols “an atheist” Comte and his idea of the Great Being, since Solovyov saw a parallel to his own intuition of God's Wisdom or Sophia in it.

²²³ Ibid. p. 159. (Там же. С. 131).

²²⁴ Ibid. (Там же).

²²⁵ I use the definition of motif by Vladimir Khalizev in Хализев В.Е. теория литературы – М.: Высшая школа, 1999. – С. 266. (V. Khalizev *Theory of Literature*) as “a component of an artistic work with an enhanced significance”. The concept of permanent motif is introduced in the 19th century by Alexandr

complicated and rather awkward construction in Kantian style he asserts: “In Kant, this thing in itself, about which we can know nothing at all, is nevertheless considered to really exist outside of us, to act upon us, and with this action to produce in us that empirical material of sensation which, clothed in *a priori* form of apprehension (space and time) and then in the categories of reason, forms the objective world of phenomena known by us, the domain of our experience”.²²⁷ So the first, short definition is given by the author himself (the “Author-Orator”) by means of a clear metaphor of “a pure X” from mathematics, but the second one is given by the “Author-Describer”, who follows the style of his characters.

This creates an additional epistemological tension in the sense that most of the main characters in Solovyov’s narrative try to identify themselves in connection with “*Ding un sich*”.²²⁸ It looks like a battle with something that does not deserve it, because the author states in the first chapter that “*Ding an sich*” “turns out to be a concept that cannot be conceived, i.e. just a meaningless combination of sounds” (and that is why I call it a “ghost”, I.S.). Rationally, the author could have denoted clearly from the beginning the status of “*Ding an sich*”, but the logic of the plot was

Veselovsky’s *Historical Poetics*, (The latest edition: Веселовский А.Н. Историческая поэтика — М.: Высшая школа, 1989 — С. 301. (Veselovsky A. *Historical Poetics*) in the atomist style (Veselovsky uses the term “nedelimy” (indivisible)) and in connection with poetics of folklore as “the simplest narrative unit which, in the form of an image, met the most various requirements of the primitive intellect and of everyday observation”. Propp thought that any motive “may be decomposed” and put in to the ground of his morphological concept. See Propp V. *Morphology of the Folktale* /translated by L.Scott/ — Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958. — p. 11. The problem of discrepancy between Propp’s and Veselovsky’s concepts can be solved on the basis of a concrete application. Propp operated with several invariants of an event in many different folklore texts of the same fairy-tale; as a result he came to the conclusion that even a motive can be decomposed. In the case of a separate text, like *The Crisis*, the motive of “*Ding an sich*” is constant. It can be called permanent for this text only. Moreover, in later texts Solovyov used the concept of “thing in itself” in connection with Kant or his philosophy, and in a terminological sense.

²²⁶ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ — Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 — p. 37 (Соловьёв В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 27).

²²⁷ Ibid. p. 38 (Там же. С. 28).

²²⁸ Fichte “was fully justified in completely rejecting the assumption of a *Ding an sich*”; it “was still present in Schelling”, and “was definitely removed by Hegel”. (Ibid. p. 48 (Там же. С. 36–37)).

to introduce it as a thing which played a major role, as it actually did, in the development of Western philosophy. Another function of this “ghost” is connected with the author’s ironic remark about positivists who “do admit a certain knowability of the absolutely unknowable”.²²⁹

So we see that the author’s critique of positivism is based on examining the moments where the positivist doctrine reveals its inner contradictions and false claims. This is an argumentative element. The permanent motif serves Solovyov’s immanent critique of positivism. The author’s ironical remarks play a key-role in the disclosure of the weak points of positivism as a universal system of knowledge.

2.12. Metaphors in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*

In this section, I am interested in a classification of different metaphors in the text, according to their functions. The most noticeable metaphor is, of course, present in the title of the Solovyov’s work: the crisis of philosophy. I call it “*a plot-forming metaphor*”. It contains the medical and bodily sense together, in the sense of an illness of Western philosophy as an organism. To some extent, the content of the metaphor is linked with traditional protests of the Slavophiles against Western rationalism, and it is possible to say that it is of an extra-textual and social nature, although the question of how it became a traditional element in Russian philosophy by the 1870s is a separate matter.²³⁰

The main feature of this plot-forming metaphor is that it contains several meanings: the critical stage, because it can lead to either death or cure (based on the lack of health), and the state of transition. These are closely connected by the medical connotation, but still may be separated. The two opposite understandings of this metaphor of crisis were elucidated in the course of criticism and reaction to Solovyov’s dissertation. One group of critics attacked the first few pages, another emphasized the concluding remarks of Chapter 5. The Crisis as a decline of Western philosophy – this was the version of the adherents of Slavophilism such as Nikolai Strakhov, who noted that the young author explained the crisis of

²²⁹ Ibid. p. 57 (Там же. С. 45).

²³⁰ I refer here to the chapter *Slavophiles and Westernizers* in the most comprehensive book on this topic: Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*. – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989. – pp. 394–455.

Western philosophy as it was already denoted by Schopenhauer. Strakhov also criticized Solovyov for exaggerating von Hartmann's role.²³¹

Vladislavlev put forward another version: "the crisis as Solovyov's personal view". In his opinion, Solovyov made a mistake in decisively stating, that the Western empirical trend did not give any knowledge".²³²

Both critics were right, and at the same time, since both optimistic and pessimistic interpretations of the medical sense of the crisis-metaphor were possible. The Romanticists had already pointed to this crisis of European culture, and even August Comte had mentioned "the great political and moral crisis of contemporary societies", and "intellectual anarchy".²³³ This is the pessimistic interpretation of the metaphor of crisis, based on the meaning of "a lack of". But one can also interpret "crisis" as a period, and state of transition. And this sense can also be found in *The Crisis*, close to the end, when the author states that "the recent philosophy (supposedly, von Hartmann's, I.S.) with a logical perfection of the *Western form* is trying to combine the wholeness of the content of spiritual contemplation of the East"²³⁴ [my translation, I.S., because, for some reason, this phrase is omitted in the English version of *The Crisis*]. The crisis can be understood as a period of transition to the synthetic "integral knowledge", of which an idea already existed in Slavophilism.²³⁵ This is an optimistic interpretation of the crisis-metaphor, based on the meaning "state of transition".

Other less central metaphors in Solovyov's text did not cause the same kind of polemics, and they can be classified according to their functions in

²³¹ Никольский А. Русский Ориген XIX века Вл.С.Соловьев – СПб.: Наука, 2000. – С. 130. (Nikolsky A. *Russian Origen of the 19th Century Vladimir Solovyov*).

²³² Ibid. p. 127–129. (Там же) "Solovyov make a mistake when he states that Western empiricism does not give any knowledge. It gives a very valuable knowledge. The English empirical school gives the best analysis of mental factors. Many important generalizations are inductive, and induction is the central method in empiricism".(p. 127).

²³³ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 151. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 123).

²³⁴ "Эта новейшая философия с логическим совершенством западной формы стремится сочетать полноту содержания духовных созерцаний Востока". (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 123).

²³⁵ See the Chapter *Ivan Kireevsky and Philosophy of Man. Rationalism as a Disintegrating Factor* in A. Walicki's *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*. – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989 – pp. 150–168.

the text. The metaphor of “one-sidedness” has its meaning in the limits of a project of “universal synthesis of science, philosophy, and religion”. This project (which is revealed only at the end of the text) is present there indirectly, and legitimized by the end of the philosophical development that “has bequeathed to the very near future a complete and universal resolution of those questions, which were resolved one-sidedly and therefore unsatisfactorily in the course of that development”.²³⁶ The metaphor of “one-sidedness” is a *philosophical* one. It helps to characterize the prior tendencies in philosophy when the author is trying to prove “the general limitation of Western philosophy: one-sided dominance of rational analysis, which affirms abstract concepts in their separateness and therefore necessarily hypostasizes them”.²³⁷ Within these bounds, each of systems is understood as one-sided and limited. The author does not, however, postulate a one-sidedness of Spinoza’s or Kant’s systems separately when he describes them, and this speaks for Solovyov’s claim with respect to rationalism as based on a kind of general presumption that all philosophers dealt with in *The Crisis* were rationalists, and not based on personal claims with respect to every representative of rationalism. At least Solovyov did not draw any conclusion about Spinoza’s, Descartes’, Kant’s and others’ systems in particular. So his claim is rather universal and has to do with his general view rather than with his specific assessment of every philosopher whose system he describes in *The Crisis*.

There is a metaphor of *methodological character* – “The first principle”. Solovyov searched for a first principle in every system he described and all of them are turned into “the hypostasization of abstract principles”. Schopenhauer “*personifies* his metaphysical will”, von Hartmann “hypostasizes this pure negation as the absolute first principle”. As I said, according to von Hartmann, “the unconscious forms and preserves the organism, often guides human actions, does not suffer, does not err” etc. It is interesting that in the Russian version “the unconscious” is written in quotation marks first, and then (probably, after the complete hypostasization in the course of the author’s description) is represented as a certain being, which even “does not vacillate and does not doubt”.²³⁸

²³⁶ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 – pp. 12. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 5).

²³⁷ Ibid. p. 103. (Там же. С. 84).

²³⁸ Ibid. p. 89 (Там же. С. 71).

There are several metaphors that can be characterized as having a function in the description of philosophical systems (*descriptive metaphors*). For example, in Descartes's system the famous "attributes" – thinking and extension – are metaphors characterizing "the actual multiplicity of separate things and substances". This system of metaphors has been developed in the "formula of Spinozism" where the metaphor of a thing is a "mode of extension", and the metaphor of a thinking creature is a "mode of thinking".

The author further introduces a metaphor of "the external empirical domain" characterizing dogmatic metaphysics: "Its content – the external material world – is given to us immediately only as a phenomenon in the form of representation".²³⁹ It is one of the rare moments when the author deciphers the content of the metaphor. Another example of the author's deciphering of a metaphor is represented in Feuerbach's system. The author finishes the analysis of his system with the reduction of "an aspiration to the general good" to "the exclusive self-assertion of each separate individual at the expense of all others".²⁴⁰ As a confirmation of this developed metaphor the author gives a reminder of its short version, connected with Hobbes and "the war of each individual against all".²⁴¹

2.13. Questions in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*

All the questions that we can find in the text can be divided into two categories, depending on the addressee: *the author's inquiries to the characters* (i.e. heroes or philosophers who are mentioned in the text); and *the author's questions to the reader*, aimed at the engagement of the reader into a kind of philosophical journey.

The questions to philosophers help the author to emphasize the opposition "authority – reason" in scholasticism,²⁴² to clarify the difference between substances in Descartes,²⁴³ to highlight several postulates of

²³⁹ Ibid. p. 72 (Там же. С. 56).

²⁴⁰ Ibid. (Там же).

²⁴¹ Ibid. p. 119 (Там же. С. 96).

²⁴² "In fact, reason does not contradict true authority, but what authority is true?" (Ibid. p. 14 (Там же. С. 7)).

²⁴³ "But what conditions this multiplicity, what difference differentiates substances from one another? How then does a given extended substance differ from a given thinking substance?" (Ibid. p. 20 (Там же. С. 12)) There is another question which is connected with Spinoza; "What would Spinoza said about a mode that

Spinoza,²⁴⁴ and to raise the reader's distrust of the pretension of positivism to create a "universal world-view",²⁴⁵ etc. The questions to positivism look rather fault-finding ("too rigorous", as the author notes). There is an element of irony in his attitude to the anti-metaphysical and anti-religious position of positivism.²⁴⁶ If religious and metaphysical problems exist empirically in the corpus of human history, how can positivists pretend that their conclusions about the nonsense of metaphysical problems have a universal character?²⁴⁷ The author gradually leads the reader to a recognition of "the inherent *limitations* of positivism".²⁴⁸

The questions to individual philosophers (which suggest the presence of a dialogue between thinkers in the space of thought) help the author to divide quite complicated elements of their teachings. Sometimes there are several questions in different chapters of the text, as in the case with Schopenhauer.²⁴⁹

We can also find questions to the reader, but not very often and mostly in the places where the author uses the novelistic mode of narration. And in

destroys the substance?" (Ibid. p. 101 (Там же. С. 82)) but I cannot call it a question to Spinoza. It is rather a rhetorical question to the reader, which follows a direct question to Schopenhauer, and which does not suppose a reply, although in the space of dialogue a reply is easy to imagine. The reader guesses what sort of answer Spinoza could give. This question is asked in the course of the figure of parallelism of two philosophical systems: "In Schopenhauer separate individuals have the same relation to the universal will as individual modes have to substance in Spinoza".

²⁴⁴ If this is the case, in what then does the necessity of finite things consist? Where does number, even if infinite in substance come from? Where does the multiplicity in it come from?" (Ibid. p. 23 (Там же. С. 15)).

²⁴⁵ Ibid. p. 150 (Там же. С. 122).

²⁴⁶ For example, in this paragraph: "But even if we retreat from the requirement as too rigorous, we certainly have the right to demand that at least all the actually existing religious and metaphysical views conform to the theological and metaphysical phases that Comte has defined. For, otherwise, what significance could be possessed by a scientific law to which the actual phenomena that enter into its domain do not conform?" (Ibid. pp. 157–158 (Там же. С. 129))

²⁴⁷ The basic principle, or essence, of positivism consists of the fact that, besides observable phenomena as external facts, nothing exist for us, and that the relative knowledge of these phenomena therefore constitutes the sole actual content of human consciousness. For positivism, everything else is completely alien and inaccessible. Given such a basic conviction, in such a state of consciousness, what must religion and philosophical metaphysics be for positivists?" (Ibid. p. 167 (Там же. С. 137)).

²⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 168 (Там же. С. 138)).

²⁴⁹ Ibid. pp. 62, 68–69, 100 (Там же. С. 49, 54–55, 81).

these rare cases, the questions fulfill meta-language and emotive functions.²⁵⁰ It means that these questions make the academic style of the book more diverse and lively, for example, at the beginning of the first chapter, where we find several questions on the same page.²⁵¹ The author thus establishes a situation of dialogue with the reader. The sequence of questions just afterwards is connected with Kant's role as cultural hero, and repeats questions posed by Kant: "What is knowledge?" "Is it possible, and how it is possible, to know what actually is?" This kind of questions belongs to the eternal philosophical problems that are common to the author, the characters of his narrative and the reader, and they articulate the space of thought in which the narration is developed, and the space of dialogue between the author and the reader.

2.14. Forms of Representation of History and the Historical in *The Crisis*

In this section, I will analyze the text from the point of view of the types of emplotment and modes of argumentation which are the central categories of meta-historical interpretation.²⁵² There are two mytho-poetical components in the plot of the text – the end of philosophical development (crisis), which was introduced from the beginning of the narrative, and the transfiguration of philosophy, which is connected with its return to its roots. These roots are located by Solovyov in "the ancient East and especially the Christian East", and this brings to the text a motif of eternal

²⁵⁰ Jakobson R. *Linguistics and Poetics* // Jakobson R. *Selected Writing* in 5 vols., vol. 3, *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry* – The Hague: Mouton Press, 1981. – p. 22. (Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика // Структурализм: "за" и "против" – М.: Прогресс, 1975. – С. 198).

²⁵¹ "Was it long ago that it seemed certain that after a long series of philosophical doctrines, each of which asserted itself as the absolute truth but was then refuted by the following doctrine as an error, the human mind (represented by Western thinkers) had finally found a haven in the negative result of positivism, which considered the resolution of the higher questions of thought to be absolutely impossible and their very posing absurd?" (Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* /Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 – p. 35 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 25) It is interesting to notice that in the English version the question "Thus, so what?" before the sentence about "that the matter is not so simple as the positivists think" is missing.

²⁵² White H. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* – London: John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – p. 7.

return, and makes the history of European philosophy cyclic. This motif introduces the similarities of the last achievements of philosophy with the original intuitions of Christianity. It appears by the end of the text in such a sudden and extraordinary way that it can only be explained by a poetic logic of the plot.²⁵³ From this point of view, the East already had all the wholeness of spiritual contemplation at which its younger brother – the Western world and its way of thought (rationalism) – arrived as a result of a long philosophical search. In this moment of generalization the author does not use inductive logic, and follows rather a poetic logic where a miracle looks possible, if not necessary. This can be illustrated by an example of the primacy of the East being taken for granted. The author does not even care to explain to the reader the details of similarities between a Buddhist world-view and Schopenhauer's teaching, although they were clear for him.²⁵⁴ He switches smoothly to the results of von Hartmann's philosophy and to "the absurdities" that must be removed from it (and if we ask the question of who will do it, we hardly find a proper answer, whether it will be Solovyov himself or other philosophers of the Western tradition). He has drawn his fundamental conclusion about the coincidence between the last

²⁵³ Walicki sees in this point of the book a proof of the autonomous character of Solovyov's philosophy and his break with Slavophilism. He writes: "The notion of 'Orthodox thinking' has been replaced by a vague generalization concerning the return of philosophy to truths contained in the 'theological doctrines of the East' – a generalization that appears at the end of the book as a kind of *deus ex machina*. Solovyov adopted Kireevsky's philosophical ideas but tore them from the total context of Slavophile doctrine, and by doing so set them up as an autonomous philosophical theory". (Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989 – p. 563). It is not surprising that Walicki describes it in the manner of literary studies and uses the term *deus ex machina*, which is more relevant for ancient tragedy.

²⁵⁴ The author takes for granted the postulates of Schopenhauer that "universal essence is expressed in empty and never satisfied will and desire, so that being, in its essence, is *suffering*. The supreme (and unique) good, then, is nonbeing, and the ultimate goal is therefore determined to be the *annihilation of being through the self-negation of the vital will*". It is obvious that these thoughts are very close to the Buddhist world-view, and Solovyov is aware of it because later in *The Crisis* he writes: "the fundamental dogma of Buddhism is the complete nothingness, the 'emptiness' of all that exists, and its supreme goal is Nirvana, the complete extinction of all life". (Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* /Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996 – pp. 145–146, 158 (Соловьёв В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 119, 128).

achievement of Western philosophy and the spiritual contemplation of the East, and this gives Walicki a reason to draw his conclusion about the *deus ex machina* at the end of Chapter V in *The Crisis*.²⁵⁵

We see that there are three kinds of emplotment in the text of *The Crisis*:

1) mythological, at the beginning and the end of *The Crisis*, as the ways of Western philosophy are seen to lead miraculously to the same conclusions that were already made, centuries before, in the East.

2) the chronicle in the Introduction and Chapter I, where we can see the chronological order and the parallelism of two descriptions based on this chronology (schematically outlined in syllogistic form). Syllogism is the main instrument of Western rational thought, so it is not accidental that historical development of Western philosophy, as represented in *The Crisis* at the level of composition of the text, has taken the form of syllogism.

3) novelistic, where we can see inversions in the narrative when the author comes to the Hegelian and Schopenhauerian systems two and three times respectively in different contexts; there are a few individual philosophical portraits; there is a polemical tone and the role of rhetoric figures and tropes in the narrative is very important in the dialogue with Western philosophical systems.

I have mentioned that the metaphor of “one-sidedness” (limitedness) is philosophical, and appears many times in the text. Sometimes it becomes a *generalizing metaphor*, especially when Western philosophy, and, in a broader sense, rational thought is declared as the “hypostasization of abstraction”. According to Solovyov, this one-sidedness “follows necessarily from rational knowledge in its exclusiveness, for, remaining itself, it cannot relate to itself negatively, cannot recognize the results of its activity as only abstractions or one-sidedness”.²⁵⁶ The same feature of one-sidedness and limitedness is attributed to all non-rationalistic tendencies in Western philosophy, too, because, in Solovyov’s opinion, “all other tendencies of thought in Western philosophy appear only as reactions or protests against the dominant tendency, and therefore are distinguished by

²⁵⁵ Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989 – p. 563).

²⁵⁶ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 94 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 76).

a similar one-sided limitedness”.²⁵⁷ As I said, the author has denoted the “absurdities” in the latest philosophical systems: he proposes to eliminate “the grotesque duality of abstract hypostasies – of will and idea”,²⁵⁸ and from his description of Schopenhauer’s and von Hartmann’s philosophy we can see what “does not permit them to effect an integral inner synthesis of the opposite principles”.²⁵⁹ In the end, he proposes as the final goal not Nirvana but “the kingdom of spirits, as the complete manifestation of the all-one”.²⁶⁰ Here we see the constructive agenda of Solovyov’s idealism, aimed at a synthesis of basic philosophical intuitions. I will not suggest a new definition of this kind of idealism, but rather refer to Losev’s characterization of Solovyov’s approach as “sophianic (*sofiiny*) idealism”. According to Losev, “of all types of idealism Sophian idealism is *the richest with elements of materialism* in the history of philosophy”.²⁶¹ But we should remember that Losev drew this conclusion on the basis of the whole corpus of Solovyov’s works, especially from later works when his conception had become clearer.

Paul Valliere’s general account of Sophiology “as a grand speculative enterprise” as well as his statement that sophianic “speculative formulations, while plausible when viewed in isolation, have relatively little explanatory power” is correct. However, for the characterization of Solovyov’s position and, especially his personal speculations in the field of history, the term “sophianic” might be useful.²⁶² First of all, it is applied to Solovyov, who left a “laconic” outline of “sophiology” in the *Lectures on Divine Humanity*,²⁶³ which Valliere accepts. Secondly, Solovyov incorpo-

²⁵⁷ Ibid. (Там же).

²⁵⁸ This is a rare example of an ironic interpretation of the idealistic philosophical system that supposedly was close to the author’s spirit. (Ibid. p. 140 (Там же. С. 114)).

²⁵⁹ Ibid. p. 141 (Там же. С. 115).

²⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 148 (Там же. С. 121). Solovyov actually wrote about “the kingdom of spirit” (*tsarstvo dukha*) in *The Crisis*, although there is the phrase “kingdom of spirits” (*tsarstvo dukhov*) in Solovyov’s poetry.

²⁶¹ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 626 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*). We can find a development of these ideas in the article: Гараева Г. Софийный идеализм Вл. Соловьева: Сущность и историческая характеристика // Общественные науки, № 2 – М.: Известия вузов. Северо-Кавказский регион, 1999. – С. 63–69. (Garayeva G. *Solovyov’s Sophianic Idealism: An Essence and A Historical Characteristization*).

²⁶² Valliere P. *Sophiology as the Dialogue of Orthodoxy with Modern Civilization* // Kornblatt J. D. and Gustafson R. /Editors/ *Russian Religious Thought* – London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. – pp. 178 – 179.

²⁶³ Ibid.

rated some elements of existing Sophiology and constructed a system out of it.²⁶⁴ So it gives his universal and religious vision of mankind: “Sophia is the humanity that God sees, and loves in Christ from eternity”.²⁶⁵ All we need to apply the sophianic characterization to Solovyov is to link it to the existing conceptions in the history of philosophy, as I have already done in section 2.3.

In *The Crisis*, Solovyov remained within the boundaries of an academic dissertation, just revealing his main philosophical intuitions, to be developed later. In Chapter 3, I will take up some problems of development of Solovyov’s primary system of narrative.

2.15. A Synthetic Model of Narrative Analysis

In this section, I bring together the main results of my analysis of *The Crisis* in order to present the overall narrative structure of the text, and to answer the question of how the narrative, rhetorical and argumentative elements of Solovyov’s story are related to each other. I start with an analysis of Solovyov’s story at the level of ideas and actantual structures (personages), and gradually come down to the level of narrative and discursive structures in the text.

The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists), as the title emphasizes, is the story of a crisis — its causes, development and possible outcomes. The composition of a classical drama with its traditional elements — Prologue, Chapters I-V, the Epilogue (in the case of *The Crisis*, the Appendix with the title *Auguste Comte’s Theory of Three Phases in the Intellectual Development of Humankind*) — fits this purpose well. The main intrigue is connected with the author’s statement that “philosophy in the sense of an abstract, exclusively theoretical knowledge has ended its development”, and he does not “consider it fruitless” which is different from the positivists’ “usual negative attitude towards philosophy”.²⁶⁶

The culmination of this dramatic crisis is present in Chapter III, when it becomes clear for the author and the reader that even the latest

²⁶⁴ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 209–258. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

²⁶⁵ Valliere P. *Sophiology as the Dialogue of Orthodoxy with Modern Civilization*, p. 178.

²⁶⁶ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ — Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. — p. 11. Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 5).

achievements of Western philosophy – Schopenhauer’s and von Hartmann’s systems – “share the general limitation of Western philosophy: one-sided dominance of rational analysis”.²⁶⁷

Finally, the *dénouement* comes in Chapter V, appearing as *deus ex machina* in the author’s statement that Western philosophical development affirms “the same truths that have been affirmed in the form of faith and spiritual contemplation by the great theological teachers of the East”, and his project of the “realization of the universal synthesis”.²⁶⁸ The *deus ex machina* effect is total, because there is not a hint at this *dénouement* in the Introduction and Chapters I-IV, even the names of the Eastern Fathers of the Church, who with all probability represent “the wholeness of the content of spiritual contemplation of the East”, are not mentioned in *The Crisis*.

It is hard to imagine the dramatic tensions between the personages of a drama who all share the same “general limitation”. But this is not clear from the beginning, and that is precisely the intrigue of the drama. Within the history of Western philosophy, which unfolds progressively from *Introduction* to Chapter III, with a comeback to Kant at the beginning of Chapter I, most personages are linked to each other by relations of predecessor-successor (as Kant and Fichte), or by the common range of problems they dealt with (as Erigena and Descartes, Schopenhauer and von Hartmann). I call this relationship between personages within the general story about Western philosophy “functional”. In sections 2.4 and 2.5, I describe them and find several cardinal (nuclear) functions in Solovyov’s narrative alongside some catalyst-functions of less importance. The cardinal functions of the personages actually make the story about Western philosophy cohesive. The number of functions (there are multifunctional personages, such as Kant, or Hegel, and mono-functional personages – Abelard, Thomas Aquinas, Rosenkranz etc.) depends on the novelty of their ideas. Because of the novelty of their ideas, personages like Erigena, Descartes, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, and Schelling play the role of cultural heroes.

In the case of Kant, who started “a new philosophical development”²⁶⁹ and whose *Critique of Pure Reason* produced a “revolution” in the general course of Western philosophy, there are five functions; moreover they all link to some further development, and so all of them are cardinal functions.

²⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 103. (Там же. С. 84).

²⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 149 (Там же. С. 121–122).

²⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 33 (Там же. С. 24).

The functions of Bacon, Berkeley, and Rosenkranz are not linked to further development in philosophy (at least not in Solovyov's interpretation), and they can therefore be called catalysts, especially in the case of British philosophers, who represent the second important current in philosophy, namely empiricism, "which finds its ultimate and fullest expression in positivism itself".²⁷⁰ At the same time, the role of empiricism in *The Crisis* is limited to being a predecessor of Kant's "revolution" and to the positivism contemporary with Solovyov. The use of functions (in the sense of Propp – Barthes – Bremont) thus helps to classify all personages of Solovyov's story.

Solovyov's general account of the history of philosophy remains within the Hegelian teleological and retrospective conception, and the Schellingian conception of philosophy of revelation, which can be called organicist, in White's terms. However, there are differences, connected, first of all, with Solovyov's position outside the mainstream of European philosophy. For him, European speculative rationalism can be imagined as something alien, at which he is able to look afresh, because he is a Russian philosopher familiar with the controversy between Slavophiles and Westernizers, and representative of a developing and modernizing culture and philosophy actively looking for its place in the world and history. By training, Solovyov is a European philosopher, but his Russian background allows him to pick up different elements of the European philosophical tradition in combination with purely Russian elements. In *The Crisis* these elements are obvious: an appeal to the Christian East and the great theological teachers of the East (remarkably, they are not mentioned in the text), his critical attitude to both major European currents – metaphysics and empiricism in their different versions, and, as a result, his project of integral knowledge. The latter has been briefly outlined in *The Crisis*, to be developed in *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*. So, *The Crisis* introduces Solovyov's projective and prophetic vision of the history of philosophy. In Russian terms it is called sophianic by Losev, who thereby emphasized the synthetic nature of Solovyov's idealism and its "synthetic account of all major philosophic oppositions".²⁷¹

Turning to the level of narrative and discursive structures, I would like to mention, first of all, the important distinction between the chronicle

²⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 11 (Там же. С. 5).

²⁷¹ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 259. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

narration and novelistic narration I have introduced in section 2.2. Solovyov's story about European philosophy is built as a drama, because there is a shift from the chronicle narration in the Introduction and Chapter I, where one can trace back the functions of personages (their role in the chronicle narration is functional as cultural heroes and predecessors-successors), to novelistic narration, where the element of unpredictability, unexpected turns, and struggle between personages come to the fore. The individual philosophies Solovyov describes in Chapters II, III and IV belong to those thinkers for whom the author feels more affection – Kant, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, von Hartmann (Solovyov more generally emphasizes his affection for German philosophers in his correspondence at the time when he was working on *The Crisis*²⁷²). I call these descriptions of philosophers individual portraits, and their role is to show a diversity of approaches within rationalism, despite the one-sidedness it shares with other rationalists.

There are two forms of involvement of the author in the narrative: 1) the Author-Describer, such a dominant figure that one hardly notices its presence, because it is everywhere in *The Crisis* (section 2.8), and 2) the Author-Orator. The rare moments when the latter comes to the fore and it introduces a sharp contrast in the narrative.

Furthermore, there is the textual element of a cognitive nature, which plays not only an argumentative but also a narrative role (as permanent motif, described in section 2.11). The ghost of the Kantian “*Ding an sich*” makes post-Kantian philosophers struggle with and reassess it.

Several supplementary elements of discourse have been analyzed in sections 2.7, 2.9–2.13. They are mostly of different natures, but can be unified under the name of “elements of discourse”. Here is the core of my work, because these elements of Solovyov's discourse and their role in his text have never been analyzed.

I have found several rhetorical elements: irony (sections 2.9 and 2.10), parallelisms, metaphors (section 2.12), *reductio ad absurdum*, and contradictions. They are mostly aimed at the positivists and their systems. I think that they also play an argumentative role in the text, so they can be called rhetorical devices employed by the author for his argument. Especially Solovyov's critique of positivism is based on rhetorical elements such as irony and *reductio ad absurdum*. By definition, these elements cannot

²⁷² Соловьев В.С. Письма (под ред. Э.Л. Радлова), в 4-х т., Т. 3 – СПб.: Время, 1908–1923. – С. 106 (Solovyov V. *Letters* in 4 vols.).

determine the strategy of the text, because it is already presupposed by Solovyov's critical attitude to rationalism and positivism. I only state that their role is also significant in Solovyov's conception; and, strictly speaking, one cannot separate them from one another, because they constitute the framework in which the content (Solovyov's critique of positivism) is expressed. We must take into account that, apart from the purpose of obtaining an academic degree in philosophy by means of interpreting its history, *The Crisis* was written as a theoretical blow to positivism, with narrative, rhetorical, and literary elements backing up the author's argument, and making his cognitive strategy a combination of argumentative and narrative devices. Generally speaking, this interplay of argumentative and narrative devices makes *The Crisis* interesting to read, even after the utopian project of integral knowledge has passed, in its turn, "into the world of the past". Using the elements of narrative analysis, we can explain why it was so attractive, and still keeps its attraction.

2.16. Conclusions

Apart from the influence of Solovyov's first work as a well-grounded personal vision of the philosophical development in Europe, we also note Solovyov's influence on the reader through suggestive and artistic elements of *The Crisis*, on which I have focused in this chapter.

The main conclusion of this chapter is that philosophy and the history of philosophy can be fruitfully interpreted as a specific kind of narrative, and explored from the point of view of how stories are told in philosophical texts. This gives a supplementary perspective for study of a philosophical text from the formal point of view, i.e. asking which narrative and discursive elements the text contains, and their role in the argumentative structure of the text. This makes it possible to describe different ways of representing the basic philosophic ideas of the author (Solovyov in our case), and of expressing these ideas. The narrative analysis I have done here allows me to conclude that the interpretation of the text from the point of view how it is made, taking into account results of a long tradition of studying the text from different points of view (positions which mostly highlight the content of the text, its ideas, and the tradition starting from the polemics immediately following on the defense of Solovyov's dissertation), allows me to explain the attractiveness of the text, even if the conception of the author might look obsolete at some points.

What we have learnt from this attempt at narrative analysis is that an interplay between the argumentative and narrative elements of the text is individual, and thus requires individual scrutiny, which is possible under the condition of a relative isolation of the text from other works by the same author, and from the tradition to which the text belongs. Narrative analysis, in combination with some elements of rhetoric, literary, and textual analysis, provides a refreshing perspective from which it is appropriate to talk about the role of those narrative elements in a philosophical text which have not yet been mentioned and studied, even within the long and rich tradition of study of Solovyov. Apart from this, the narrative approach enriches Solovyoviana itself, which, as I have shown in sections 1.3 and partly 2.1, is not very diverse in terms of methodological approaches.

As in any other text having a content that cannot be reduced to an ordinary literary or artistic fiction, in the historical and philosophical text of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, too, we find a unity of narrative and cognitive (argumentative) components; basic ideas cannot be separated from the form in which they have been expressed. Unifying literature and philosophy under the name of a specific form of language, we have to recognize that, just as in traditional *belles-lettres*, stylistic devices and tropes are equally components of an artistic whole. In philosophy and the history of philosophy (like many other synthetic texts of the 19th century *The Crisis* represents both), the rhetorical component is an inalienable part of the author's cognitive strategy, i.e. a significant element of knowledge, not just an optional decoration for the text.

This conclusion takes us beyond *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. In the following chapter, I am going to show that narrative elements play a significant role in other works of Solovyov, that the narrative approach is applicable to Solovyov's philosophical and literary works, and that a development of his narrative strategy can be outlined on the basis of key texts from his later career.

CHAPTER 3. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRIMARY SYSTEM OF NARRATIVE IN SOLOVYOV'S WORKS

3.1. Choice of Solovyov's Works and Preliminary Remarks

In this chapter, I am going to present some narrative elements in other works of Solovyov. The task of describing the poetics of Solovyov's philosophy now becomes more complicated, because it is necessary to take into account the evolution of Solovyov's intuitions, points of view, and the plots of different texts. Also important is the choice of Solovyov's most representative works. To some extent, a textual analysis of Solovyov's work can be applied to any work, even a very small one, and the completion of this theme goes far beyond the confines of this chapter. But the task of describing of how the key ideas of *The Crisis* appear, work, and return is more circumscribed. In this chapter I will investigate the further development of Solovyov's system of narrative by focusing on the way in which a limited number of key ideas from *The Crisis* reappear in Solovyov's later and major works, notably *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (1877), *Lectures on Divine Humanity* (1877) (Velichko called these lectures "central" for Solovyov¹), and *Three Conversations* (1900).

The general method of narrative analysis demands that I examine how the artistic elements mentioned and described in chapter 2 return or are transformed in Solovyov's later works. The task becomes more difficult because such elements re-appear in different contexts, which often reflects a development of Solovyov's philosophical position or evolution of his philosophical system, which is only outlined in *The Crisis* and developed in other works.

Several scholars have called Solovyov's system "Sophiology"² or "Sophianic idealism".³ This term refers, first of all, to *The Philosophical*

¹ Величко В.Л. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творения – СПб., 1904. – С.35.(Velichko V. *VI. Solovyov. Life and Works*).

² In the dictionary *Russian Philosophy*, Sophiology is defined as the metaphysics of All-unity, developed *sub specie Sophiae*, and is characterised by two elements: the aesthetic element, and a traditional mystico-theological element (Русская философия. Словарь – М.: Республика, 1995. – С.105). For more details and a critical analysis of Russian Sophiology see Khoruzhy's book: Хоружий С.С. О старом и новом – СПб.: Алетейя, 2000. – С.9 (Khoruzhy S. *On the Old and the New*). See also Slesinski R. *Sophiology as a Metaphysics of Creation*

Principles, Lectures on Divine Humanity, A Critique of Abstract Principles and *The Justification of the Good*. Solovyov's central and original ideas like "Godmanhood" (Divine Humanity), "positive All-unity", "integral knowledge" (the last term we can find already in I. Kireyevsky's and Khomyakov's works,⁴ but it was Solovyov who tried to give it a concrete elaboration) become the central themes of different works after *The Crisis*. In contrast with more critical or content-oriented approaches of Y. Trubetskoi, Mochulsky, Zenkovsky, Losev however, my intention is to discuss Solovyov's basic ideas from the point of view of narrative analysis.

3.2. Religion as Key Idea or Centre of Narration in Solovyov's Major Works

We can find many statements by different scholars about Solovyov's major works, and analysis of these can give a clear picture of his ideas. Zenkovsky states that "Solovyov's philosophical works grew from many roots, not from one – but alongside with this, his thought was always facing the task of an organic synthesis".⁵ If someone asks the question about the nature of this synthesis, the answer is that it is both an artistic intuition and a purely theoretical task, although it is not clear how these ideas can be combined in one theory. I would suppose that they can be combined in Solovyov's works as a whole, but for the most part I analyze separate works. The combination of ideas in the whole philosophical system of Solovyov (this term looks very traditional, which is why I use it) has an intuitive character, which makes it less systematic, and shows many similarities with an artistic work.

according to Solov'ev // Bercken W. van den, de Courten M., van der Zweerde E. *Vladimir Solov'ev: Reconciler and Polemicist. Selected Papers of the International Vladimir Solov'ev Conference held at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in September 1998* – Leuven: Peeters, 2000. – pp. 131–146.

³ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 624 – 625. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

⁴ Florensky P. *Around Khomyakov // On Spiritual Unity. A Slavophile Reader* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim and Robert Bird / – Houndon: Lindisfarne Books, 1998. – p. 343.

⁵ Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., Т.2, ч.1 – Л.: Эро, 1991. – С. 17 (Zenkovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.). Zenkovsky mentions the main sources of Solovyov's philosophy: 1) the general influence of the 1860s in Russia; 2) the *idée fixe* of "a new religious consciousness"; 3) the idea of Integral Knowledge taken from Slavophilism; 4) the sense of history; 5) the idea of Godmanhood; 6) the idea of Sophia. In comparison with Sergei Bulgakov, Zenkovsky assesses Sophia as only of secondary importance for Solovyov".

As a rule, a key idea is a component of a separate text, and in the case of purely philosophical works like *The Philosophical Principles*, *Lecture on Divine Humanity* or *A Critique of Abstract Principles* the titles speak for themselves. However, there is a tradition of defining the key ideas for Solovyov's works as a whole. The authors often draw conclusions on the ground of the whole corpus of Solovyov's works, at least his philosophical works. Ernest Radlov, for example, writes that "all of Solovyov's philosophy touches only one subject, but touches it from three different sides: Solovyov only wrote about religion, Christ, and the Church".⁶ If we take into account that Solovyov understood religion as "a connection of humanity and the world with the absolute principle and focus of all that exists",⁷ the mention of the religious character of his works makes the paradigm of research very broad, because this religious character has many aspects. First of all, it is Christian religiousness, sometimes without any confessional limits.⁸ This freedom from limits led Solovyov, for example, to a secret reunion with the Catholic Church, about which his nephew, Sergei Solovyov, has written.⁹ I shall not attempt to solve the problem of Solovyov's confessional identity here, but I would like to say that, for a person who saw "everything, more or less, *sub specie aeternitatis*, or, at least, *sub specie antichristi venturi*",¹⁰ the confessional identity cannot have been very important. In his private talks Solovyov spoke about it in a rather simple manner: "Where can you find perfection? All Churches make mistakes"¹¹.

⁶ Радлов Э.Л. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творения. — СПб., 1913. — С.54. (Radlov E. *Vladimir Solovyov. Life and Works*).

⁷ Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ — Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. — p. 1 (Соловьев В. С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Правда, 1989. — С. 5).

⁸ The confessional limitation of the Russian Orthodox Church was severely criticized by Solovyov, and he could only publish these ideas outside Russia (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time* (Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 348–403)). Losev argues that Solovyov "deeply understood the one-sidedness of the three main confessions in Christianity, and their role in the world process". (Ibid. p. 399).

⁹ Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция — М.: Республика, 1997. — С. 310 — 323. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*).

¹⁰ Соловьев В.С. Письма (под ред. Э.Л.Радлова), в 4-х т., Т. 4 — СПб.: Время, 1908–1923. — С.205. (Solovyov V. *Letters*, edited by Ernest Radlov, in 4 vols.).

¹¹ Лукьянов С.М. О Вл.С. Соловьеве в его молодые годы, в 3-х т., Т. 3 — М.: Книга, 1990. — С. 6 (Lukyanov S. *On Vl. S. Solovyov in his Youth*, in 3 vols.).

Coming back to Solovyov's philosophy, it is appropriate to say that he saw the calling of philosophy in answering the question about "the purpose of all that exists".¹² That is why he posed questions about everyday life, and gave a reply from a universal Christian perspective. This kind of discourse has a name of its own in Russian tradition: "He belongs, first and foremost, to the long Russian tradition of *bogoiskateli* or God-seekers".¹³ Jonathan Sutton's judgment is well correlated with the central purpose of Solovyov's life, "to justify the faith of the Fathers and elevate it to a higher level of rational consciousness".¹⁴ The religious perspective in Solovyov's works has its basis not only in his own personal religious vision, but also in the apologetic task of defending this perspective from different kinds of challenges.

The *Lectures on Divine Humanity* start from an apologetic remark: "I shall discuss the truths of positive religion, subjects that are very remote from contemporary consciousness and foreign to the interests of the contemporary civilization".¹⁵ Solovyov's concern with the scientific and antireligious position (widespread in society contemporary to Solovyov) is clear from the beginning. The author's narrative intention is to dialogue with it, rather than give the monologue of a lecture or, as Solovyov says, "the revision of different principles still possessing the human consciousness".¹⁶ To some extent in Solovyov's every major work we can find a dialogue with an alien ideology (positivism in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, or some general modern point of view as in *Lectures on Divine Humanity* and *The Justification of the Good*). The author adopts the position of a prophet, meaning that he emphasizes his independence from human or public opinion. And it is supposed that supporters of his position will come to the fore at some time in the future. This happened at the beginning of the 20th century when the poet-symbolists, Andrei Bely and Alexandr Blok, created such an image of Solovyov; and their portrayal of Solovyov proves that he was indeed perceived by many of his contemporaries as a

¹² Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 140.).

¹³ Sutton J. *The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov. Towards a Reassessment*. – London: Macmillan Press, 1988. – p. XI.

¹⁴ Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 10-и т., т. 4 – М., 1913. – С.243 (Solovyov V. *Works* in 10 vols.).

¹⁵ Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – p. 1 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 5).

¹⁶ Solovyov V. *A Critique of Abstract Principles*. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 586).

prophet.¹⁷ The author's initial intention takes into account this kind of misunderstanding by his contemporaries, in combination with the understanding of "a future reader". It is, of course, a component of the romantic world-view, with "a dissatisfaction with the present, the impossibility of being satisfied by everyday life",¹⁸ but the author considers it to be unselfishly assisting the world. In *The Justification of the Good*, Solovyov writes: "At the present stage of human consciousness those few who already possess a firm and final solution of the problem of life *for themselves*, must justify it *for others*. An intellect which overcomes its own doubts does not render the heart indifferent to the delusions of others".¹⁹ This compassion extended to the world and one's neighbor does not mean the author rejects purely schematic philosophic constructions in his text.

3.3. Schemes²⁰ in *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*

In *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*,²¹ Solovyov's second major work, we can see that the author moves from the history of philosophy, the main theme of *The Crisis*, to philosophy itself. Solovyov wrote this text as a pure philosopher, focusing on the clarity and transparency of his philosophical constructions, not on the foundation of his concept in the history of philosophy. This makes the text more suggestive, since the role of the author and his voice becomes more significant. The author's main intention is not to confirm his conception from the history

¹⁷ Белый А. Золото в лазури — М.: Скорпион, 1904. — С. 147 (A. Bely, *Gold in Azure*); Блок А. Рыцарь — монах // Сборник первый о Владимире Соловьеве — М.: 1911. — С. 75–103. I used the latest edition in Владимир Соловьев: Pro et contra. Личность и творчество Владимира Соловьева в оценке русских мыслителей и исследователей. Антология — СПб.: Изд-во Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 2000. — С. 200–226 (Blok A. *The Knight-monk* // VI. Solovyov: Pro et contra. *Personality and Works of Vladimir Solovyov in Works of Russian Thinkers and Researchers*).

¹⁸ Литературный энциклопедический словарь — М.: Наука, 1987. — С. 337 (*Encyclopedia of Literature*).

¹⁹ Solovyov V. *The Justification of the Good* — Edinburgh, R.&R. Clark, 1918 — p. XV. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., т. 1 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 83).

²⁰ Zenkovsky mentions "the passion for schemes in Solovyov's works" (Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., Т.2, ч.1 — Л.: Эго, 1991. — С. 17 (Zenzovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.)).

²¹ Sergei Solovyov states that *The Philosophical Principles* are the link between the dialogue *La Sophie*, written in Cairo, and the *Lectures on Divine Humanity*. Several pages coincide word for word". (Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция — М.: Республика, 1997. — С.133. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*)).

of philosophy, but to elaborate his idea with more suggestive, schematic, and clear postulates. In *The Philosophical Principles*, the dominant ideas are not historic-philosophical as in *The Crisis*, but rather epistemological, intended as the foundation of his metaphysics of All-unity.²²

The central idea of *The Philosophical Principles* is to outline the concept of integral knowledge. According to Mochulsky, *The Philosophical Principles* is “the first sketch of a philosophical system, where the scheme is outlined, the basic ideas are clarified, the most important parts are roughly worked out: philosophy of history, logic, and metaphysics. The problems elaborated in this work are central for Solovyov”.²³ *The Philosophical Principles* has been interpreted many times by different scholars, and the pre-dominant conclusion is that the author has achieved ultimate clarity of the philosophic concept of All-unity, but to the detriment of the clarity of his philosophic writing and style.²⁴ Analysis of this work has been given in terms an evaluation of the philosophical project of integral knowledge, and scholars have typically linked it with another of Solovyov’s major works, *A Critique of the Abstract Principles*.²⁵ Solovyov’s reflection on the religious

²² The term “metaphysics of All-unity” appears in Zenkovsky’s *History of Russian Philosophy* (Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., Т. 2, ч.1 – Л.: Эго, 1991. – С. 34).

²³ Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М.: Республика, 1995. – С. 107. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*).

²⁴ Трубецкой Е.Н. Миросозерцание Владимира Соловьева, в 2-х т., т. 1 – М.: Медиум, 1995. – С. 110–117 (Trubetskoi E. *Vladimir Solovyov’s World-View*, in 2 vols., vol.1); Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., Т.2, ч.1 – Л.: Эго, 1991. – С. 26–27 (Zenkovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.); Зеньковский В.В. Русские мыслители и Европа. Критика европейской культуры у русских мыслителей // Зеньковский В.В. Русские мыслители и Европа – М.: Республика, 1997. – С. 126–127. (Zenkovsky V. *Russian Thinkers and Europe. A Critique of European Culture by Russian Thinkers* // Zenkovsky V. *Russian Thinkers and Europe*); Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция – М.: Республика, 1997. – С.132 – 141. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*); Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989. – pp. 565–569; Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М.: Республика, 1995. – С. 107–110. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*); Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 112–128 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

²⁵ Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*. – Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1989. – pp. 569–570; Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т., Т.2, ч.1 – Л.: Эго, 1991. – С. 31–36 (Zenkovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.).

calling of philosophy was developed in *The Philosophical Principles* to the point of claiming religious categories for the highest (absolute) level of the social organism.²⁶ Solovyov here retains his critical vision of the “one-sidedness” of European rationalism.

Solovyov planned to present *The Philosophical Principles* as his doctoral thesis in 1876.²⁷ Because of the unfavorable discussion of this work by influential critics like Strakhov²⁸ and Vladislavlev,²⁹ however, the work was not finished and, in fact, stops at the place where its publication in 1877 in *The Journal of the Ministry of Education* ends. At the same time as *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*, Solovyov wrote *A Critique of Abstract Principles* which was presented as a doctoral thesis instead. The preparation of *The Philosophical Principles* as a dissertation affects the text, which is full of triadic schemes, definitions, explanations of different concepts, deductive statements and other well-known phrases in “the style of academic aphorisms”,³⁰ connected mostly with Schelling’s style. Arseny Gulyga calls this style “a system of short definitions, placed in logical sequence, and in its laconic brevity giving a clear picture of the development of thought”. Losev summarizes the philosophic style of Solovyov in *The Philosophical Principles* as “iron schematicism” (*zhelezny skhematizm*, in Russian).³¹

We can find these schemes in many places in *The Philosophical Principles*, either as a verbal description, or as a pure scheme with the categories of Solovyov’s philosophy grouped into special tables.³² The triadic schemes

²⁶ Zenkovsky states that the concept of “the universal synthesis of science, philosophy and religion obtained its complete elaboration in *The Philosophic Principles*, (Ibid. p. 26).

²⁷ Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция — М.: Республика, 1997. — С.132. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*); Лукьянов С.М. О Вл.С. Соловьеве в его молодые годы, в 3-х т., Т. 3 — М.: Книга, 1990. — С. 359. (Lukyanov S. *On Vl. S. Solovyov in his Youth*, in 3 vols.).

²⁸ Переписка Л.Н.Толстого с Н.Н.Страховым, 1870—1894, Т.2 — СПб: Толстовский музей, 1914. — С. 108. (*The Correspondence between Lev Tolstoi and Nikolai Strakov*).

²⁹ Соловьев С. М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция — М.: Республика, 1997. — С.133. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*).

³⁰ See Gulyga’s comments to the Russian edition of Schelling’s works: Шеллинг Ф. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1989. — С. 575).

³¹ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 128 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

³² For example, Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 153, 261).

widespread in this text, on the one hand, recall the influence of Hegel's system and philosophical writing³³ (although by this time it was out of date). Here Solovyov clearly adheres to dialectics. On the other hand, they create the poetic space in the text, and a specific quality of persuasiveness as the reader is led to truth by these triadic formulas.³⁴

The quintessence of the schematicism of *The Philosophical Principles* is the synoptic table³⁵ of the “main forms of the organism of Humanity”

³³ There are different remarks on the influence of the “triadic system of Hegel”, “the law of development” according to Herbert Spencer, and of Slavophilic messianism on *The Philosophical Principles* (See Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М.: Республика, 1995. – С.108. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*); Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 195 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*)). Solovyov thought that the “three important moments of development discovered by Hegel in their logical universality, were not applied to the development of all spheres of the organism of Humanity, which was looked at mostly from a static point of view”, but he adds later, that “the general formulas of Hegel will stay as eternal formulas of philosophy” (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 177, 195)). In Chapter 4 and 5, before reflecting on the concept of the Absolute, Solovyov gives the outline of the development of dialectics from the Eleatics to Hegel, and makes a clear distinction between his own positive dialectics and Hegel's method (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 227–229)).

³⁴ Sergei Rotsinky thinks that “Solovyov saw not only logical but mystical sense in these omnipresent triadic forms”. (Ротинский С.Б. Владимир Соловьев и западная мысль. Критика. Примирение. Синтез – Элиста: АПП “Джангар”, 1999. – С. 46. (Rotsinsky S. *Vladimir Solovyov and Western Thought*)) From the formal point of view, poetic and mystical senses are hardly possible to divide, and their function in the text is the same. So I would prefer to call these elements of the text “poetic”.

³⁵ Ibid. (Там же, С. 153):

I	II	III
Sphere of Creation	Sphere of Knowledge	Sphere of Practice
Subjective ground – feeling	Subjective ground – thinking	Subjective ground – will
Objective principle – beauty	Objective principle – truth	Objective principle – common good
1 level – Mysticism absolute	Theology	Spiritual community (the Church)
2 level – Artistic work formal	Speculative philosophy	Political community (the State)
3 level – Technical skill material	Positive science	Economic community (the Local)

which separates the description of “the unified living organism of Humanity” and the illustration of the laws of this development in human history. Nine parts of this table summarize all the triadic constructions and phrases of the first Chapter. Generally speaking, these triadic constructions could seemingly be groundless without this accompanying illustration in a table. Phrases like “human nature itself represents three main forms of being: feeling, thinking, and will”,³⁶ or “the will is determined by three main relations, or, in other words, is represented at three levels” do not sound convincing without this table.³⁷ The table just gives an impression that it corresponds to reality. Its authority is based on the visual shape and appeal. There is a formal element: triadic schemes which help to organize the text as a whole. The structure of human society (“the organism of Humanity”) is characterized by a triadic scheme as well. According to Solovyov, it consists of three forms: Economic society, State, and Church.³⁸

The most interesting transfiguration of the mytho-poetic space in *The Philosophical Principles* starts at this point of the text, especially when the triadic forms are applied to things which, at first sight, have nothing to do with the synoptic table.

All important statements in this passage have a triadic form. For example, “It is true, that nobody is in troubles to assume the following common features of mystic and artistic creation: 1) both of them have sense as their basis (not knowledge or active will)” 2) both have as their main tool or means imagination or fantasy (not reflection or external activity) 3) finally, both presuppose ecstatic inspiration (but not quite conscious) in their subject”.³⁹ Here is an example of an appeal to “the law of development”: “According to the law of development, the organism of Humanity has to go through three stages (three phases, three moments of development)”.⁴⁰ The author repeats this triadic scheme very often, and he

³⁶ Ibid. p. 146. (Там же. С. 146).

³⁷ Ibid. (Там же).

³⁸ Ibid. pp.146–148. (Там же. С. 146–148).

³⁹ In this place one still can see some connection with the synoptic table mentioned above. Other examples of this “triadic thinking”: “The organism of Humanity is a complicated organism. First of all, the three highest levels of general or ideal beingtogether make one organic whole”. (Ibid. p. 174 (Там же. С. 174)); “This triadic division of philosophy from its nature itself has a very ancient origin”. (Ibid. p. 195 (Там же. С. 195)).

⁴⁰ Ibid. p.154 (Там же. С. 154). In another place one can find: “Naturalism goes through three stages of its development”. “Obeying the general law of historical development, philosophy goes through three main stages,” etc.

is so enthusiastic that at some point it sounds strange that the author proclaims that “all the variety of systems in academic philosophy can be reduced to two main types: naturalism and idealism”. And immediately, the author returns to the triadic schemata: these “systems of the school philosophy” are grouped into “three combinations of two main types”.⁴¹ It looks like a replay of three stages in a fairy-tale. The author masks this triadic replay by the statement that it is generally accepted. Actually, he just appeals to the fact of triadic division as indisputable (the logic of miracle works well, up to the moment when the reader asks the elementary question: why is everything divided into three parts, rather than four or five, and why into these three parts in particular?).

In Chapter IV, which ends with another synoptic table of nine categories⁴², we find a whole series of triadic divisions. The examples of these triadic divisions can be multiplied. Eventually, they can discourage anyone from reading Solovyov’s works. But we should remember that the author had to repeat all these triadic formulas, even though they are slightly alien to Russian culture (at least their compatibility with Russian thought is disputable).⁴³ It was a necessary moment in the development of Solovyov’s philosophical writing and of Russian philosophical culture as a whole.⁴⁴ Lev Lopatin saw an advantage for Russian philosophy in this usage of terms, and stated his preference for Solovyov over contemporary European thinkers. He wrote: “We can state with conviction that,

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 180 (Там же. С. 180).

⁴² “So the Absolute, relating in its *Logos* to its primary matter (*materia prima*), represents itself in categories of the existing, essence, and being in the following main definitions”:

I	II	III
The Existing as itself (God)	The Essence (the content or the idea)	The Being (the way or mode of being, the nature)
1. Spirit	The Good	The Will
2. Mind	The Truth	The Representation
3. Soul	The Beauty	The Feeling

⁴³ About the non-systematic tradition of Russian philosophy see Лосев А.Ф. Русская философия // Введенский А.И., Лосев А.Ф., Радлов Э.Л., Шпет Г.Г. Очерки истории русской философии – Свердловск: Изд-во Уральского ун-та, 1991. – С. 67–74 (Losev A. *Russian Philosophy*).

⁴⁴ I understand philosophical culture as “the place where philosophy is developed, where positions enter in conflict, give rise to new positions, become dominant or subdominant, influential or marginal”. For a detailed description see: Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Philosophy – the Ideology and the Handmaid. A Historical and Critical Analysis of Soviet Philosophy, with a Case-Study into Soviet History of Philosophy* – Nijmegen, 1994. – pp. 13–16.

because it came to the stage later, Solovyov's system is more mature and broader in thought compared with the constructions of his predecessors".⁴⁵

Someone had to go through Hegelian formulas this way, and Solovyov was the first who passed along this way, towards the creation of a philosophical system.⁴⁶ Even more, Solovyov created a philosophical system under conditions not favorable for philosophy highly speculative knowledge, when a strong and noticeable "philosophical culture" was only just emerging in Russia.⁴⁷

It is clear that in *The Philosophical Principles* the author wanted to smooth the rigidity of his triadic constructions with Christian theological terminology. For example, when he defines the Absolute principle in accordance with categories of existence, essence, and being, Solovyov uses the names of the Trinity.⁴⁸ Such an abundance of theological terminol-

⁴⁵ Lopatin thinks within the broader European context and compares Solovyov with leading European thinkers. He looks back and takes as his example of philosophy "the deeply thoughtful German philosophical systems which were created in the prime-time of German speculative philosophy at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century". (Лопатин Л.М. *Философские характеристики и речи* — М.: Academia, 1995. — С. 112. (Lopatin L. *Philosophical Characteristics and Speeches*).

⁴⁶ An example of Hegel's style in Solovyov: "Each self-representation embraces from the side of the one that represents itself three necessarily general moments: 1) the manifesting in itself or about itself, when the manifestation is a concealed, or potential state; 2) the manifestation as itself, i.e. the assertion of itself in the other or on the other, discovery, definition or expression of the manifestation, its Word, or *Logos*; 3) returning of the manifesting to itself or self-defining of the manifesting in manifestation. The Absolute, existing in itself (1) necessarily distinguishes itself (2) and in this distinguishing staying as itself, asserts itself as itself (3). (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 242)).

⁴⁷ The concept of philosophical culture with respect to Solovyov, has been developed in Zweerde E. van der *Reflections on Philosophical Culture // Metaphilosophy* /Edited by Murava L./ — St.Petersburg: Eidos, 1997. — pp. 31–54 and Zweerde E. van der *The Normalization of the History of Philosophy in Post-Soviet Russian Philosophical Culture // The Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*, Vol. XII — Boston: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2001. — pp. 95 — 104.

⁴⁸ "We must denote each of the positive principles of the supreme Trinity by its own name in order to avoid inconsistency. We will keep the name *en-soph* (positive nothing) for the first, as its own, the principle of the first center; the own character of the second center cannot be expressed better than by the name Word, or *Logos*; finally, we will call the third principle the Holy Spirit". (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 242–243)).

ogy in *The Philosophic Principles of Integral Knowledge* makes the text more traditional, more closely connected to Orthodox theology and clearer for the reader.⁴⁹ There are several implicit quotations from the New Testament,⁵⁰ with the purpose of showing similarities between Solovyov's own philosophy and the Orthodox tradition (this was vitally necessary for a text published in an official Russian publication like *The Journal of the Ministry of Education*), and of expressing the ideas of this extremely complicated academic text by means of the simple words of the New Testament. This use of a later metaphor was done in order to give the schemata of *The Philosophical Principles* a human, Christian face. That is why the "iron schematicism" can be analyzed as a narrative device. It is not an unnecessary decoration but is at least a feature of the narrative. The triadic schemes in *The Philosophical Principles* look like a principle of structuring a philosophical text which is outdated (by the time when Solovyov wrote it). They do make the text very systematic, and emphasize a triadic logic in the philosophical analysis of different notions and categories, as well as spheres of life. The reader should follow this logic almost uncritically, because any doubt on the triadic structure of the forms of "the Human organism" causes the narrative to lose its persuasiveness. That is why the author often uses assertive constructions like: "There is no

⁴⁹ The theological tradition was no less familiar to Solovyov than the Hegelian one. We can judge about an equal presence of Orthodox theology and German philosophy in Solovyov's philosophical evolution on the grounds of his letter to Ekaterina Selevina, where he mentions reading both "German philosophers and Greek theologians" (Solovyov V. *Letters*, in 4 vol. (Соловьев В.С. Письма, в 4-х т., Т. 3 – СПб., 1911. – С.106.)). An analysis of details of Solovyov's attitude to German philosophy and Greek Patristics can be found in: Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 168 – 177, 187 – 204 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

⁵⁰ "The real and objective morality for man is that he consciously and freely serves this common purpose and identifies his personal will with it; and this identification, which is at the same time a liberation of the human will inevitably happen when he realizes the truth of this idea. "Know the truth, and the truth will make you free" (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 177)); "Love is self-negation of being, and assertion of the other, and by this self-negation the highest self-assertion is committed. When we say, that the Absolute principle by its own definition is the unity of itself and its negation, we repeat, but in a more speculative form, the words of the great apostle: God is love". (Ibid. p. 234 (Там же. С. 234)); "In the beginning there was the Word, and the Word was in God, and God was the Word. It was in the beginning in God. Everything was born through it and nothing was born without it" (Ibid. p.243 (Там же. С. 243)).

doubt”, “obviously”, “truly”, etc.,⁵¹ as though such assertiveness makes the experienced critical reader uncomfortable.

3.4. The Engaging Mode of Writing in *Lectures on Divine Humanity*

This section is about the tropes and stylistic devices in Solovyov’s *Lectures on Divine Humanity*. Solovyov’s way of writing in this lectures is not very sophisticated, but clear and engaging. The lectures and their publication were oriented to a broad audience of educated people, not only to academics. Solovyov worked on *The Philosophical Principles* and a part of this work was published under original name. At the same time Solovyov worked on a course of public lectures that was delivered and published later under the name *Lectures on Godmanhood* (*Lectures on Divine Humanity*, in modern translation).⁵² The most speculative part of the original work went to *The Philosophical Principles*. The course of lectures became an independent work. This affected the manner of Solovyov’s writing: Losev mentions the significant public resonance of this work, and “a free and rather critical approach towards the traditional religion of that time”.⁵³

The printed version of this work is a series of lectures connected with one central theme of discussion, namely the problem of “the truths of positive religion”.⁵⁴ The author tells of the “realization of All-unity” as the purpose and sense of the world process. In his opinion, almost everything

⁵¹ Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* ((Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 152–155) I must say that the most authoritative scholar of Solovyov thought that “one should start to read Solovyov from his dissertations (*The Crisis of Western Philosophy and A Critique of Abstract Principles*, I.S.) and *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*. (Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 703 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

⁵² Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция – М.: Республика, 1997. – С.145 – 152. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*).

⁵³ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 137–139 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*). It is interesting to mention that Mochulsky united analysis of this work with Solovyov’s teaching on Sophie in the same chapter, *The Teaching on Divine Humanity and Sophie* (Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М: Республика, 1995. – С. 111– 120. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*).

⁵⁴ Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – p. 3 ((Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 7).

that concerns religion can actually be placed within this theme. It could be socialism, which wishes “to occupy the empty place that religion has left”,⁵⁵ or Buddhism as “a negative religion”.⁵⁶ On the one hand, the triadic scheme of historical and theological constructions plays an important role in the *Lectures*⁵⁷ (some ideas coincide word for word with *The Principles*, as for example, the characterization of the results of modern civilization, and assessment of the bourgeois revolutions in Europe). On the other hand, *Lectures on Divine Humanity* is a more open text oriented towards the expression of ideas rather than a detailed description, demonstration and proof. The author (or lecturer with a kind of prophetic image) is present in the text and declares his important role from the beginning, by phrases like: “I shall discuss”, “I am not going to refute socialism”, “I have said”, etc. This text is aimed more at being delivered as a lecture, than at being read.

There is a short note published in *The Orthodox Review* (*Pravoslavnoye Obozreniye*, Febr. 1878) which reveals Solovyov’s initial plan.⁵⁸ In compari-

⁵⁵ Ibid. (Там же).

⁵⁶ Ibid. pp. 45, 65 (Там же. С. 47, 68).

⁵⁷ Here are several examples of productive and persuasive usage of this triadic scheme: “The great Revolution proclaimed liberty, equality, and fraternity. It proclaimed them, but it did not actualize them” (Ibid. p.3 (Там же. С. 7)). “The absolute principle is thus required by our intellectual, moral, and aesthetic interest. In their unity these three interests constitute the religious interest.” (Ibid. p.30 (Там же. С. 32)). “Initially, we have three basic elements. The first is nature, the given, the present reality, the material life and consciousness. The second element is the divine principle, the sought goal and content, which gradually reveals itself. The third element is the human person, the subject of life and consciousness. (Ibid. p.37 (Там же. С. 40)). “The complete and true answer to the fundamental metaphysical question is thus found in the synthesis of these three concepts, i.e., of atom, living force (monad), and idea. This synthesis can be expressed by a simple and common word, the word *entity*. Indeed, the concept of entity inwardly unites these three concepts”. (Ibid. pp. 54–55 (Там же. С. 57)).

⁵⁸ “The initial six lectures out of twelve will describe the necessary transition from the natural stage of the human mind to the central idea, first realized in Christianity. The main stages of this transition, as they have being represented in the intellectual history of pre-Christian humanity, will be taken into account, namely, Buddhist pessimism and nihilism, Platonic idealism and the monotheism of the Old Testament.

Six more lectures will deal with a positive development of this religious idea. I will talk about a realization of Divine Humanity in eternity and in time, about the divine world and the fall of spiritual beings, about the origin and meaning of the natural world, about the Incarnation and Redemption, visible and invisible Church, the end of the world process and the Revelation of Divine Humanity”. (Православное обозрение, № 2 – М., 1878. – С. 344).

son with *The Philosophical Principles*, where the author “leaves the vascillating ground of peoples’ opinions” and “turns to the objective research of the problem” from the beginning,⁵⁹ the author in the *Lectures* involves his listeners, especially when he tries to highlight the deficiencies of contemporary Orthodox Christianity, and explain these with the help of examples. He mentions positivism and, especially *the truth of socialism*,⁶⁰ which is a marker of interest and plays the role of a bait, even for a contemporary reader. Combining terms like “the truth of positive religion” and “the truth of socialism” in the same text was explosive and roused public interest together with political suspicion in Russia, where socialism was associated not only with liberalism, Marxism and anarchism, but with political extremism and the radical terrorist groups, which started organizing attempts upon the life of the tsar and his officials exactly at the beginning of 1878, and assassinated the tsar in 1881.⁶¹ In this atmosphere of political instability associated with socialist ideas, lectures that spoke simultaneously of the truth of religion and the truth of socialism were doomed to be an extraordinary and controversial event.

That is why there were problems with authorities, and with getting permission to deliver these lectures. Although he declared the theme of *Lectures* to be religion (this was probably the only way of obtaining permission from the Ministry of Education),⁶² Solovyov himself did not expect that the authorities would give him permission.⁶³ Following his agenda, from the very beginning he characterized the current state of religion in modern society as pitiful, explained the collective claims of

⁵⁹ Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* ((Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 140).

⁶⁰ Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – p. 3 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 7).

⁶¹ Федоров В.А. История России, 1861–1917 – М.: Высшая школа, 1998. – С. 118–122. (Fyodorov V. *History of Russia, 1861–1917*).

⁶² “The aim of the *Lectures* of Mr. Solovyov is: to elucidate the rationality of positive religion, to show that the truth of faith in all its wholeness of concrete content is at the same time a truth of reason. The central idea of the *Lectures* – the idea of Divine Humanity (Godmanhood) or the Living God”. (Православное обозрение, № 2 – М., 1878. – С. 344).

⁶³ He wrote to a friend: “I was delayed in St-Petersburg arranging the public lectures on religion. They faced great obstacles, which were suddenly and unexpectedly removed not without interference of an important person” (a letter to Dmitry Tsertelev of 1878). Solovyov V. *Letters* in 4 vols. (Соловьев В.С. Письма, в 4-х т., Т. 2 – СПб.: Общественная польза, 1911. – С. 242.).

religion, and commented on the failure of religion to become the dominant principle as a deficiency of Western civilization.⁶⁴ The perspective here is a rather strange mixture of Slavophile messianism and universality based on “the theory of cultural types” developed by Danilevsky, who was at this time author of the famous book, *Russia and Europe* (1871), and “will perhaps be considered a Slavophile *par excellence*, the culminating point in the evolution of this trend”.⁶⁵ Solovyov spoke of “the law of division of historical functions”, saying that “one and the same nation cannot realize two universal ideas, perform two historical acts”, and that “the task of laying the foundation for that religious future is reserved for another historical force”.⁶⁶ This means that in 1877–1878 he was still thinking in

⁶⁴ “Contemporary religion is a pitiful thing. Strictly speaking, religion does not exist as the dominant principle, as the center of spiritual attraction. Instead, our so-called religiosity is a personal mood, a personal taste. Some people have this taste, others do not, just as some people like music and others do not. The whole of contemporary civilization is characterized by this striving to organize humanity outside of the absolute religious sphere, to establish itself and make itself comfortable in the realm of temporal, finite interests. From this one can see the great significance of the negative Western development, the great purpose of Western civilization. The civilization represents a complete and consistent falling away of human natural forces from the divine principle, their exclusive self-assertion, their striving to found the edifice of universal culture upon themselves”. (Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – pp. 3 – 11. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 7–14)).

⁶⁵ Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989. – p. 504. See also: Fadner F. *Seventy Years of Pan-Slavism in Russia. Karamzin to Danilevskii, 1800–1870* – Haarlem: Georgetown University Press, 1962 – pp. 314–338; Kuvakin V. /Editor/ *A History of Russian Philosophy. From the Tenth Through the Twentieth Centuries*, in 2 vols. vol. 2 – Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1994. – pp. 399–409. Solovyov criticized Danilevsky severely in his later works, after he broke with Slavophilism: *Otvet Danilevskomu* (Reply to N. Danilevsky, 1885), and *Grekhi Rossii* (The Sins of Russia, 1887) where Solovyov states that “Danilevsky, as all Slavophiles, turned out to be a half – prophet”). But in the 1870s, he used some of Danilevsky’s productive ideas. At least in the *Lectures* the influence of Danilevsky and his terminology is obvious. Solovyov is the author of the large article on Danilevsky in the *Brokgauz – Efron Encyclopedia* (Solovyov V. Danilevsky (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 406–414)).

⁶⁶ Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – p. 12 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 16)).

terms of the late Slavophile paradigm, clearly outlined and developed by Danilevsky in 1871.⁶⁷

This type of reflection can easily be assessed as a narration from a universal point of view (first of all, because the author is judging Western civilization). The ideal type of society in this narrative is theocracy, and the author expresses his nostalgia over the loss of religious feeling in contemporary society. At the beginning of the second lecture, he makes a paradoxical statement: "I have said that the purpose of Western development, of Western extra-religious civilization, is to serve as a necessary transition for humanity from its religious past to its religious future".⁶⁸ A listener (or reader) thinking in terms of a positivist or "progressive" paradigm might be rather skeptical of that perspective of a future restoration of religion, but the author puts definite stress on the future, and this is certainly beyond the objective scientific paradigm, and is a sphere of hypotheses and meditations, as is philosophy itself. So the listener is involved in this paradoxical circular movement of time, when the future follows the rule of the negation of negation.⁶⁹

Many remarks in the text are signs of the presence of "contemporaneity", usually marked negatively.⁷⁰ For example, Solovyov emphasizes the "insolvency" of contemporary Catholicism, the "weaknesses of Protestantism", the deficiencies of "contemporary consciousness". It is interesting that all these concepts represent rather Western trends. The "contem-

⁶⁷ At the same time Solovyov also wrote the famous article *Three Forces* (Три силы // Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 19–31) where one can find a concise expression of the same ideas about a "new historical force": "So, the third force that has to give human development its absolute meaning can be a revelation of a higher divine world, and those people, this nation, through which this force has to appear, must be a mediator between Mankind and that world, the free and conscious tool of the latter" (p.29).

⁶⁸ Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – p. 13 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 16)).

⁶⁹ "We can gain some idea of the general character of this future, if we consider the sins of the religious past, the essence of its chief untruth, which necessitated its negation as well as a negative transition towards other forms". (Ibid. p.13 (Там же. С. 16)).

⁷⁰ The author thinks that it goes without saying that "to dwell upon the mental and moral discord and lack of principle that are prevalent not only in society but also in the head and heart of each individual would be superfluous, for this is only too apparent to anyone who is at all introspective or observant. (Ibid. p.2 (Там же. С. 5)).

porary consciousness” is seemingly a predominant educated public opinion in the Russia of Solovyov’s days. The central narrative intrigue is linked to the fight against this common opinion. The conclusion based on it also appeals to the weakness and contradiction of the contemporary consciousness, which “acknowledges that the human person has divine rights, but does not attribute to this person either divine powers or divine content”.⁷¹

The author uses terms which are very up to date and attractive to Russian society of that time, such as “socialism”, “human rights”, “equality”, “liberty”, “democracy”, “positivism”, “materialism”, “brotherhood”, etc.⁷² They are mentioned in the first lectures in order to start a polemic with fashionable trends of thought, and activate the reader’s interest by the use of fashionable terminology. After the motive of “absoluteness” is introduced at the end of the second and beginning of the third lecture (“A person is able to attain positive absoluteness as well”, “the human I is absolute in possibility”, “absolute content”, “absolute character of human life”), the role of contemporary opinions and prejudices is reduced to negative examples,⁷³ especially in contrast with absolute and timeless truths. Of course, it is easier to criticize others from the position of external and absolute truth, and any criticism from this position is very effective. Within this paradigm (for those who accept such absolute truth), materialism is incorporated and does not answer any questions. After the introduction of “the argument of God” and the postulate that “for God *freedom is necessary*” the author pronounces a sentence on materialism: “Thus by their generality and indefiniteness, the fundamental propositions of materialism, which are undoubtedly true, do not exclude anything and leave all questions open”.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Ibid. p.18. (Там же. С. 21).

⁷² Ibid. pp. 2–10. (Там же. С. 5–13).

⁷³ For example, the short outline of the grounds of materialism has a rather negative characteristic: “Thus, we must acknowledge that the general fundamental assertions of the mechanistic world-view, or materialism (I am using the two terms without distinction here, for I have in mind only that sense in which they coincide), are perfectly true. This may be reduced to two main assertions: (1) *all that exists consists of force and matter*, and (2) *all that occurs, occurs of necessity, or according to immutable laws*”. In their generality, the propositions do not exclude anything and can be accepted even from the spiritual point of view”. (Ibid. p. 20 (Там же. С. 23) With this two points of view the materialistic is discriminated against from the beginning; and the spiritual position just condescends to an acceptance of materialism.

⁷⁴ Ibid. pp. 21–22. (Там же. С. 24–25).

The same thing happens to socialism, which “appears to be a historically justified force, and the West’s immediate future undoubtedly belongs to it”.⁷⁵ But the great pretence of socialism turns out to be beyond its reach, and socialism becomes doomed in Solovyov’s narrative as well. It is clear, from the author’s point of view of Christian universality, that any current state of affairs and current theory must look weak, and is doomed to “insolvency”.

Other possible points of the reader’s interest are examples from contemporary science.⁷⁶ They rather expose its illusory pretensions of knowledge, as happened to the example with the Cathedral of St. Sophia.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Ibid. p. 5. (Там же. С. 9) After such an optimistic remark about socialism as the immediate future of Europe, we can see that this pretension does not look well grounded, and in the next sentence Solovyov unmasks socialism: “But it does not wish to be only a historical force and to have only a conditional justification. Socialism wishes to be the supreme moral power. Its pretension is to actualize the absolute truth in the realm of social relations. But socialism unavoidably, fatally, falls into a self-contradiction, and its insolvency becomes evident”.

⁷⁶ Solovyov’s attitude to science and scientific knowledge as a “force” turned skeptical a number of years before he wrote the dissertation with its subtitle *Against the Positivists*. Solovyov wrote Ekaterina Selevina in 1872: “I have an opinion that to study empty ghosts of the external phenomena is more silly than to live by empty dreams. It is more important that this “science” cannot achieve its goals. People look into microscopes, cut poor animals into small pieces, boil some water in retorts and imagine that they are studying *nature*”. (Solovyov V. *Letters* in 4 vols. (Соловьев В.С. Письма (под. ред. Э.Л.Радлова), в 4-х т., Т. 3 – СПб.: Общественная польза, Время, 1908–1923. – С. 64)) His friend Dmitry Tseretelev wrote about Solovyov’s skepticism of science at the beginning of the 1870s, (Цертелев Д.Н. Из воспоминаний о Владимире Сергеевиче Соловьеве // Книга о Владимире Соловьеве – М.: Советский писатель, 1991. – С. 304), and it is known that Solovyov had problems with exams in physics at the university in 1872 (Лукьянов С.М. О Вл. С. Соловьеве в его молодые годы, в 3-х т., Т. 1 – М.: Книга, 1990. – С. 137. (Lukyanov S. *On Vl. Solovyov in his Youth*). So there are some personal reasons for Solovyov’s rejection of the philosophical claim of positivism to absolute and truly knowledge.

⁷⁷ Solovyov writes: “Let us take a simple example. Let us suppose that at the present moment you are thinking about the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Constantinople. Even if your mental picture of the temple is conditioned by certain movements of brain particles, these movements are not present in the mental picture itself. Only the figure of the temple of St. Sophia is present in it. It is clear that the material dependence of the picture on some unknown particle movements in the brain has nothing at all to do with the formal content of the picture, since the image of St. Sophia and the movements of brain particles are completely heterogeneous and incommensurate objects” (Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* / Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – p. 27 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 29)).

Another point of interest is formed by the funny stories and anecdotes the author tells in the *Lectures*.⁷⁸ The author uses examples from literature either to illustrate an important idea,⁷⁹ or to expose the lack of sense in some doctrine, as is the case with Bulwer's fairy tale.⁸⁰

There are interesting examples of the play of points of view, when the author several times invites the reader to take "the standpoint of the dominant natural-scientific world-view".⁸¹ The author begins by just expressing his suspicion that the materialistic view is "very simple indeed".⁸² Later he has to prove that the materialistic view of the world is limited, and disprove the opinion that "if all entities endowed with senses disappeared from the world, the world would nevertheless remain as it is" as completely wrong. For this, he invites the reader to take the purely

⁷⁸ For example, the story about "the founder of a socio-religious sect in America, who substituted his own twelve for the Ten Commandments of Moses, the first of which states, "Love thyself" – a quite legitimate requirement, but one that is rather superfluous". (Ibid. p. 6 (Там же. С. 10)). Another anecdote is connected with socialism: "Socialism sometimes claims to realize Christian morality. About this, someone made the well-known jest that only one slight difference distinguishes Christianity from socialism: while Christianity urges one to give away what is one's own, socialism urges one to take what belongs to others". (Ibid. p. 6 (Там же. С. 10)).

⁷⁹ "Inner liberation from nature in the self-consciousness of pure personhood was first clearly expressed in Indian philosophy. It is addressed, for example, in the Ankhya-Karika, a work ascribed to the seer Kapila, the founder of the philosophical school of Sankhya and, in all probability, the nearest predecessor of Buddhism. According to Sankhya-Karika, the true and perfect knowledge through which one attains liberation from all evil consists in the decisive and complete differentiation of the material principle of the natural world from the feeling and knowing principle, that is, from the I". (Ibid. p. 39 (Там же. С. 41–42)).

⁸⁰ "If an outside observer could see all that was happening in your brain (as it is depicted in Bulwer's fairy tale *A Strange Story*), what would this observer see?" (Ibid. p. 27 (Там же. С. 29)).

⁸¹ The features of the changing point of view are described on the examples from belles-lettres in Uspensky's book (Успенский Б.А. Поэтика композиции. Структура художественного текста и типология композиционных форм – М.: Искусство, 1973. – С. 133–142. (Uspensky B. *Poetics of Composition. The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of the Forms of Composition*)).

⁸² "Here, however, I hear the usual declaration of materialism, that not only our words and bodily movements but also all our thoughts that constitute the drama are but mechanical processes – in this case, movements of brain particles. This is a very simple view indeed! But is it not so simple?" Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – p. 26 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Правда, 1989. – С. 28)).

materialistic point of view, but after the large input of spiritual vision the reader has already received by this time, the materialistic vision looks rather primitive.⁸³ Such an exposure of the weaknesses of the natural-scientific world-view is exploited by the author to prove his Schopenhauerian vision that “the world is representation” and “the fundamental entities that make up the content of the absolute principle are more than indivisible units or atoms, and more than living acting forces, or monads. They are also entities determined by absolute quality, or ideas”.⁸⁴ This idealistic conclusion (which is based on the premise of “the absolute principle”) is a result of a long chain of arguments, which is difficult to follow for the inexperienced reader (listener). But the function of this chain is very important. It facilitates the concept of the absolute – the “absolute quality, which determines all the actions of an entity and all of its receptions” – to enter the text as its organic part. It gives a justification to the concept of “the absolute” and marks its presence in the text. In this part of the text, the word “absolute” and the concept of “the absolute” are repeated several times in different contexts. There is also a set of words which could be said to represent features of the absolute: “fundamental”, “eternal and abiding”, “immutable” for the “absolute principle”, and it makes the whole paragraph more diverse. Moreover, because of this frequent repetition of the word “absolute”, the presence of “the absolute” is becoming more clear and visible, especially as the author is trying to keep up a convincing style.⁸⁵ The audience of the *Lectures* consisted of educated people, intellectuals like Dostoyevsky. Strakhov, Tolstoi, and it was important for the lecturer to pick up the arguments from a scientific field. But the concepts of God and the absolute could not be introduced by means of a purely scientific argument.

⁸³ “Even if we take as our standpoint the dominant natural-scientific world-view, we must admit that if no entities endowed with senses existed, the world would change radically in character. For this world-view, sound, for example, is, in itself, that is, taken independently of hearing, and of the organs of hearing, only a wavelike vibration of the air. But obviously, in itself, a vibration of the air is not yet what we call sound. For this vibration to become a sound, there must be an ear upon which that vibration might act and stimulate in the nervous auditory apparatus certain changes that are manifested as the sensation of sound”. (Ibid. p. 47 (Там же. С. 49)).

⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 51. (Там же. С. 53).

⁸⁵ We can find an example from science in this part of the text: “To elucidate this, one can point to the law of polarity, which reigns in the physical world: only opposite poles attract each other, since they complete and are necessary for one another” (Ibid. p. 50. (Там же. С. 52)).

Generally speaking, the concept of the absolute (God) and the eternal could not be brought to the text just by a statement, because the positivistically minded audience might want to see some proof. The concept of “the absolute” in reality is brought to the text by the author’s act of faith alone. Through the repetition of the words with an “absolute” meaning, the author either masks the moment of introduction of the absolute from the skeptical and even atheistic audience, or introduces the concept of God under a philosophical name (the Absolute) by appealing to something absolute that must exist in human life (which is actually one of the ways of proving God’s presence), or both. From the stylistic point of view, it is possible to say that the figure of “the Absolute” (not yet God, and we shall see why) is connected with the stylistic device of repetition. After “the Absolute” is introduced, the lecturer’s task becomes easier because he needs only to diversify and develop the narrative about Divine humanity. He further strengthens his position by the introduction of the view of Plato, and thus grounds the narrative about “the absolute principle” in pre-Christian history and, at the same time, outlines human history as the movement towards the revelation of God’s presence.⁸⁶ The concept of Divine humanity will be introduced later, as a final point of this development. There are two quotations from Plato: a direct one in Solovyov’s words⁸⁷ and an indirect quotation (or paraphrase): “This true reality, this genuine essence, is therefore determined not simply as an idea but as the ideal *all*, as the world of ideas, the realm of ideas”, and it has the function of a transition to the reflection that “examining the inner character of the human person can help us clarify what an idea is”.⁸⁸

The reference to Plato plays the role of an argument from authority here, and helps to justify the idealistic position at the expense of the positivist one. It is interesting to notice how the author develops his

⁸⁶ “The doctrine that ideas are the eternal and immutable essence laying at the basis of all transitory existence and phenomena, and constituting the genuine concept of the absolute principle, or the eternal, immutable all, was, as we know, first developed by Greek philosophy in the person of Plato. This was the next step after Buddhism in the revelation of the divine principle”. (Ibid. p. 51 (Там же. С. 53)).

⁸⁷ “Platonic idealism states the opposite: “If what exists immediately for us (natural being, or the world of phenomena) is not truth, is not true being, then this being, this reality can be acknowledged as untrue only because there is another reality, a reality that does possess the character of truth and essentiality” (Ibid.).

⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 52. (Там же. С. 54).

Platonic view in a style close to the positivists' understanding, starting from a compromise with scientific terminology ("a natural phenomenon", "mechanical causality"), and coming gradually to a recognition of "the Absolute" in all of us: "Every person is, first of all, a natural phenomenon, whose acts and receptions are determined by and subordinate to external conditions. Insofar as they are subordinate to the laws of external, or mechanical, causality, the properties of these action or manifestations of this person (properties that form what is called the person's empirical character) are but natural, conditional properties. Together with this, however, every person has something absolutely unique, which defies the external determinations, does not fit any formula. This inner individual character of the person is something absolute".⁸⁹ The figure of gradation starts here, and the author discloses his plan only at the close of Lecture 4: "Thus, gradually ascending, we reach the most general and broadest idea, which must inwardly cover within itself all the others".⁹⁰ At the end of Lecture 4, the author introduces the idea of "absolute goodness, or more precisely, absolute love" by equating it with the concept of "the most general and broadest idea". Here his style is no longer scientific, because the author does not give proof. He leaves the field of rational argumentation and just stops convincing and arguing at some point, and states that the idea leads to love.

He presents a gradation toward the idea of goodness, and then via "absolute good and absolute love", "ideal all" comes to God. The author equates different concepts within the same paragraph: the common idea mentioned above is "the idea of absolute goodness, or more precisely, absolute love. In essence, every idea is a good; it is the good and love of its bearer. Every entity is what it loves".⁹¹ Gradation to the idea of the Absolute (God) is facilitated by the quality "absolute" along the line: Idea Ю objective idea Ю Goodness Ю Absolute goodness Ю more precisely, absolute love" (in the Russian text the author uses the term *Bezuslovnoe blago*; the term *bezuslovny* (unconditional) is just a translation of the term "absolute", but such synonymy avoids word-for-word repetitions). And "absolute love" is given a conceptual explanation: "the universal or absolute idea is, then, absolute good and absolute love, that is love that equally contains and responds to all. Absolute love is precisely that ideal all, that all-

⁸⁹ Ibid. (Там же).

⁹⁰ Ibid. (Там же).

⁹¹ Ibid. p. 53. (Там же. С. 55).

integrity, that constitutes the proper content of the divine principle". This chain is created precisely by means of equating different terms, but it creates such a high, elevated style that the reader becomes involved in the play of terms (and especially also the listener at the lecture's original delivery), and becomes convinced at least emotionally that something unique in human nature leads inevitably to the idea of God. It is a clear example of how the concept of the absolute is introduced into the philosophical text by the stylistic device of gradation.

Let us have a look at how the idea of "all-integrity", all-unity (*vseedin-sivo*), first expressed by the author in this part of the text, is connected to the presumably positivist mind of the audience. The author returns to criticism of the scientific world-view, already given in the third Lecture, and represented here as a mechanistic way of thinking. The last idea of Lecture 4 is: "For the fullness of ideas cannot be conceived as their mechanical aggregate; it is their inner unity, which is love".⁹² A critical attitude to the scientific doctrine has already been expressed, and the conventional reader would already be convinced that materialism "leaves all the questions open". So the author here achieves an impression that all-integrity at least cannot be grasped by positivist methods, and this idea of the "fullness of ideas" and "inner unity" appears well-grounded and proven, although it was introduced to the text by the figure of gradation from the concept of "entity" to "absolute good or absolute love".

At this point, taking into account the contrast with the "mechanical aggregate", and through indirect quotation from the New Testament, the author introduces the concept of God that ends the figure of gradation: "it is their inner unity, which is love".⁹³ At the beginning of Lecture 5, the author confirms that "when correctly developed, the doctrine of ideas indicates the objective essence of the divine principle, or what constitutes the proper metaphysical realm of being".⁹⁴ Then he postulates the independence of the metaphysical realm "from the natural world of phenomena" by which he completes the ground for his further reflection.

In conclusion, one can say that all key ideas and concepts of the *Lectures on Divine Humanity* are introduced in the short paragraph in which the author leads the reader to the concept of God through several substitutes for it. And in this small paragraph Solovyov's famous idea of All-

⁹² Ibid. (Там же).

⁹³ Ibid. p. 53. (Там же. С. 56).

⁹⁴ Ibid. (Там же).

unity is not only expressed and connected with Western philosophical development, as had occurred in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* (“the kingdom of spirits, as the complete manifestation of the all-one”⁹⁵), but is grounded and inserted into a tradition connected even with Buddhism and Plato. Solovyov delved deeper into the common roots of philosophy and religion and had to compensate the lack of clarity in this kind of analysis with engaging rhetoric.

3.5. The Authoritative Character and its Role in Solovyov’s Narrative

In this section I will examine the role of Hegel in Solovyov’s narrative after *The Crisis* as an example of his use of philosophical authority. In Losev’s *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*, there are overall characteristics of different links between Solovyov and his favorite personages from the history of philosophy. Losev states that “it is impossible to speak about any borrowings by Solovyov from different famous and non-famous philosophers known from history”.⁹⁶ In the traditional paradigm of philosophic research, any link between the major figures in history of philosophy can be explored as a parallel, an influence or borrowing only, and I shall not deny the parallels between Solovyov and other philosophers found by different scholars.⁹⁷ My approach allows me to get into details of these

⁹⁵ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 148 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 121).

⁹⁶ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 207 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

⁹⁷ Голубев А.Н. Гегель и Вл. Соловьев. Границы идеалистической диалектики // Доклады 10-го международного гегелевского конгресса, вып. 2 – М., 1974. – С.73–87 (Golubev A. *Hegel and Solovyov. The Limits of Idealistic Dialectics // Reports of the 10th International Hegelian Congress*); Kline G.L. *Hegel and Solovyov // Hegel and the History of Philosophy. Proceedings of the 1972 Hegel Society in America Conference* /ed. by J. O’Malley and others/ – Martinus Nijhoff: The Hague, 1974. – pp. 159–170; Dahm H. *Vladimir Solovyev and Max Scheler: Attempt at a Comparative Interpretation. A Contribution to the History of Phenomenology* /Translated from the German by Kathleen Wright/ – Dordrecht-Hollnad/Boston- USA: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1975. – pp. 325; Гулыга А.В. Соловьев и Шеллинг // Историко-философский ежегодник – М.: Наука, 1987. – С. 266–270. (Gulyga A. *Solovyov and Shelling // History of Philosophy. Yearbook-87*); Young G.M. *Towards the New Millennium: Ideas of Resurrection in Fedorov and Solov’ev // Russian Thought After Communism. The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage* /edited by P.Scanlan/ – Armonk and London, M.E.

relations and to create a kind of collective portrait of some personages in all (or most) works of Solovyov. I have already done this in section 2.6 on the grounds of Schopenhauer and Schelling in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. Because figures from the history of idealism are dominant in Solovyov's philosophical narrative, this might be called the major trend in Solovyov's relationship with different philosophers. More precisely, these are mostly philosophers of the German idealistic tradition from Kant to von Hartmann. And the fact that Solovyov wrote substantial articles about Kant, Hegel, and von Hartmann in the *Brokgauz – Efron Encyclopedia* helps us to understand how Solovyov himself assessed them and their significance. But the drawing of several philosophical portraits on the basis of all the works of Solovyov would be a theme of separate research, and I therefore limit myself to the role of Hegel in Solovyov's works.

First of all, the “failure” of Hegel's philosophy is obvious to Solovyov, and he underlines its topicality in the historic aspect only.⁹⁸ At the same time, we very often do find different remarks about Hegel in Solovyov's works; Hegel is the greatest authority to him for many spheres of philosophy. Solovyov recognized “Hegel's great service in decisively establishing, in science and the common mind alike, true and fruitful concepts of process, development, and history”.⁹⁹ I have already mentioned Hegel's role in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, where the presence of Hegelian methods is obvious.¹⁰⁰ After first mentioning Hegel in *The Crisis*, Solovyov

Sharpe, 1994. – pp. 62–72; Valliere P. *Solovyov and Schelling's Philosophy of Revelation* and Marchenkov V. *Vladimir Solov'ev and Vjaeslav Ivanov: Two Theurgic Mythosophies* // Bercken W. van den, de Courten M., van der Zweerde E. *Vladimir Solov'ev: Reconciler and Polemicist. Selected Papers of the International Vladimir Solov'ev Conference held at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in September 1998* – Leuven: Peeters, 2000. – pp. 119–130 and 211–222.

⁹⁸ Solovyov V. *Gegel* (Соловьев В. С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 440).

⁹⁹ Голубев А.Н. Гегель и Вл. Соловьев. Границы идеалистической диалектики // Доклады 10-го международного гегелевского конгресса, вып. 2 – М., 1974. – С.77 (Golubev A. *Hegel and Solovyov. The Limits of Idealistic Dialectics* // *Reports of the 10th International Hegelian Congress*).

¹⁰⁰ Alexandre Kojève wrote about Hegel's role in the works of Solovyov as follows: “In the first explication of his doctrine in *The Philosophical Principles* he reproduces Hegel almost literally, although in the *Lectures* and *La Russie et l'église universelle* the borrowings are less direct. Anyway, the Hegelian origin of dialectics, which leads to a differentiation of three states in the Absolute, and the terms that characterize these states are no less obvious”. (А. Кожев Религиозная метафизика Владимира Соловьева // вопросы философии, № 3 – М.: Наука,

expounds “the general basis of Hegel’s system”,¹⁰¹ starting from the explanation of Hegel’s principle which Solovyov gives as follows: “All has its being only in concept, or all is the concept’s being”.¹⁰² From the beginning Hegel takes the place of an authority in questions of metaphysics, and plays this role continually,¹⁰³ even if there are moments of criticism, because for Solovyov all philosophers before him, including Hegel, had the deficiency of one-sidedness. Solovyov in this manner applied Hegel’s trick to Hegel himself.¹⁰⁴

Hegel plays the role of a cultural hero in the author’s reflection on the dialectical method. The author declares: “In Hegel we find the first real application of dialectics as a process of thinking, which deduces a whole

2000. — С. 114 (“В первом изложении своего учения в “Началах” он воспроизводит Гегеля почти текстуально. И хотя в “Чтениях” и в “России” заимствования менее непосредственны, все таки гегелевское происхождение диалектики, ведущей к различению трех “положений” в Абсолютном, и самих терминов, характеризующих эти положения, от этого не становится менее очевидным”). It is important to notice that Kojive did not confirm his surmise about textual similarities between Hegel and Solovyov. They are taken for granted.

¹⁰¹ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ — Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. — pp. 44–45 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 33–34).

¹⁰² Ibid. p. 44. (Там же. С. 33).

¹⁰³ Hegelian philosophy, according to Solovyov, is the philosophy *par excellence*, “which in its sphere of formal and purely logical mind is absolutely complete and exclusive. That is why the general formulas of Hegelianism will stay as eternal forms of philosophy”. (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 195)). See also Solovyov’s article about Hegel in the *Brokgauz — Efron Encyclopedia* (Solovyov V. *Gegel* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 419–441)), in which Solovyov converted this virtue of Hegel into a deficiency: “Hegel can be called a philosopher *par excellence*, because, in comparison with others, philosophy was everything for him. For other thinkers, philosophy is an exploration of the essence; in Hegel, on the contrary, the essence itself is trying to become philosophy, to turn into a pure thinking”.

¹⁰⁴ Here is an example of Solovyov’s criticism of Hegel: “In his *Phänomenologie des Geistes* Hegel superbly proves the impossibility to define pure reality or sensual authenticity logically, but when on this ground Hegel directly denies pure reality, it is easy to see that this negation follows from of his exclusive point of view, for which the logical element is everything and the illogical does not exist at all. For any other point of view the illogical character of pure reality does not prevent it from existence, and of the two extremes Goethe’s *Gefühl ist Alles* is better than Hegel’s *Gefühl ist Nichts*”. (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 244)).

system out of one general concept”.¹⁰⁵ At the same time, the author assesses Hegel’s panlogicism and absolute rationalism as an extreme in philosophy. For example, in *The Justification of the Good* we can find an example of a negative outline of the panlogistic philosophical approach,¹⁰⁶ in which Solovyov uses a banal situation of everyday life in order to carry absolute rationalism to the extreme of absurdity. Another example of *reductio ad absurdum* (or, as the author calls it: “the result of a colossal nonsense”) of Hegelian absolute rationalism we can find in *A Critique of Abstract Principles*¹⁰⁷ in which the main reproach against rationalism (and

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. p. 227. (Там же. С. 227) One more example of the same function of a cultural hero in *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*: “In serious philosophy, the illogical separation, or the absolute dualism between *Ding an sich* and a phenomenon was eliminated by Hegel forever. (Ibid. p. 282 (Там же. С. 282)).

¹⁰⁶ “The stone exists – this is clear from its sensible effect upon us. A person who denies it can easily convince himself of his error, as has been observed long ago, by knocking his head against the stone. Stone is the most typical embodiment of the category of being as such, and, in contradiction to Hegel’s abstract idea of being it shows no inclination whatever to pass into its opposite: a stone is what it is and has always been a symbol of changeless being”. (Solovyov V. *The Justification of the Good* – Edinburgh, R. & R. Clark, 1918. – p. 183 ((Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 1 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 268–269)). On the same page, we can find a note: “It will be remembered that in Hegel’s *Dialectics* a pure being passes into pure nothing. In answer to a learned critique I would like to observe that, although I regard the stone as the most typical embodiment and a symbol of unchanging being, I do not in the least identify the stone with category of being and do not deny mechanical and physical properties of any concrete stone”. (Ibid.).

¹⁰⁷ For example: “Let us assume the opposite proposition and recognize that all-content of true knowledge depends on its form, is determined totally by the categories of reason. The absolute rationalism developed by Hegel is based on this ground. All truth, all the content of true knowledge has to be deduced from pure reason as a form of knowledge. Here any external subject is not assumed; all the subjects, all possible definitions of being have to be created by that knowledge itself. Thus, if all the content is just a result of knowledge in the process of its development, then, at the beginning of this process the pure form of knowledge only can be assumed, but this form, without any subject and content, cannot be called knowledge – this is pure thinking. So, the act of pure thinking, or pure concept, is assumed at the beginning. This is not a concept of something, some determined being, but a concept of general being, without any determination, containing nothing in itself, and not distinguishes from the concept of “nothing”, and hence equal to nothing. This is a principle, but because here (in absolute rationalism) everything is deduced out of the principle, then everything must be deduced from nothing, or everything has to be deduced as a self-development of nothing – a result of colossal nonsense, but inevitable for abstract rationalism, which admits as a principle reason only as itself, i.e. an empty form of truth, taken abstractly”. (Solovyov V. *A Critique of Abstract Principles* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 1 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 679)).

Hegel himself as its culmination) is its “abstractness” (speculativeness). Here is the central point of Solovyov’s attitude to Hegel: from his point of view, it is All-unity, but not complete, one-sided.¹⁰⁸ That is why the author sometimes exposes his hero by means of this hero’s own logic. For example, in the article *On the Way Towards True Philosophy* published in the newspaper *Rus* (1883), Solovyov develops such a claim for Hegel: “The world is the Absolute Idea”. But, as Hegel himself must admit, this idea achieved a self-consciousness and is actually thought only in human spirit; in other words, everything we know about this idea we get from our human thought”.¹⁰⁹ Solovyov criticizes Hegel’s rationalism and panlogicism as the broadest and all-unifying philosophical system of Hegel’s time; but this is a criticism from a position even broader than the Hegelian one, namely that of the “universal synthesis of science, philosophy, and religion”, which was presented in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*. Hegel was for Solovyov a philosopher *par excellence*, but Solovyov pretended by means of this universal synthesis to overcome philosophy as such. To some extent, this broader position is achieved by a mere geographical, or geopolitical fact namely that Solovyov was not a Western philosopher. At least, he would have not agreed that he was a Western thinker, although from some imaginative (e.g. Chinese, Indian, or Arabic) point of view his philosophy would be called Western.

The second pole (extreme) of this “one-sidedness” is materialism. That is why Solovyov’s remarks about Hegel are often connected with references to another extreme, as occurs with respect to mention of Hegel and the materialists in the work *On the Way Towards True Philosophy*.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ “Because for Hegel the truth is represented from its formal side, from the side of pure thinking, all logical definitions are not predicates of the existing, or the existing, but are confirmed by themselves in their abstractness. In reality it is an only one-sided, and negative as well, expression of the truth, confirmed as its absolute and positive representation, and in this sense it is, undoubtedly, false. (Solovyov V. *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 276)).

¹⁰⁹ Solovyov V. *On the Way Toward the True Philosophy*. ((Соловьев В.С. На пути к истинной философии // Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 325).

¹¹⁰ “At the same time, when some thinkers admit that what is really human is a moment of the Absolute Idea (Hegel), or a combination of material particles (materialists), others are more consistent in admitting that the absolute Idea is a thought of the human mind (Feuerbach), and that the material mechanism of nature is just our human representation, that the set of states of our consciousness, and that matter itself is just a possibility of these states (John Stuart Mill, Hippolyte Taine)” (Solovyov V. *On the Way Toward True Philosophy* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 325)).

According to Solovyov, “the principle of Hegel has the form of truth, universality, and All-unity. But it is absolutely clear that this All-unity is purely negative, that it is a principle one cannot start deducing from, and from which one cannot deduce anything if one uses good logic”.¹¹¹ This is the final judgment of Solovyov on abstract rationalism (of which Hegel is the authority and symbol). Coming to this conclusion, Solovyov’s general attitude towards Hegel as a philosopher *par excellence* does not change, but in different moments and situations, and at certain places of his works we can find different aspects of this attitude. Solovyov thinks of Hegel’s principles as samples of specific philosophy, or as an extreme of rationalism which leads to a crisis, an absurdity, a thinking where nothing is thought, colossal nonsense, etc. So, Hegel can play both an absolutely positive and absolutely negative role in Solovyov’s narrative. It is caused by Solovyov’s opinion that abstract principles (philosophy) are not integral knowledge he worked on. Losev, who did not follow Solovyov’s framework of integral knowledge, especially in the Soviet time, and criticized him from a position of a philosopher, claimed in his last work that “it is necessary to draw the conclusion that the question of Solovyov’s attitude to Hegel is quite a confusing one”.¹¹² I have just tried to show the passages in which we can find differences of attitude, and to provide reasons for why he seems to contradict himself in different contexts.

3.6. The Dialogue Form in Solovyov’s *Three Conversations*

In this section, I will discuss how the form of dialogue helps the author to develop the dispute between his personages and what the advantages of the dialogue form are in this case.¹¹³ In this way, I develop Judith Kornblatt’s analysis of Solovyov’s *Three Conversations* in her article

¹¹¹ Solovyov V. *A Critique of Abstract Principles* (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 1 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 680).

¹¹² Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 198 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

¹¹³ Adrian Helleman characterizes *A Short Story of the Antichrist* as “a series of Platonic –type dialogues in which Solov’ev discusses the themes of war, progress, and the end of history, in reaction primarily to Tolstoj, but also to Marx, and to Nietzsche (Helleman A. *Solov’ev’s Views on Protestantism* // Bercken W. van den, de Courten M., van der Zweerde E. *Vladimir Solov’ev: Reconciler and Polemicist. Selected Papers of the International Vladimir Solov’ev Conference held at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in September 1998* – Leuven: Peeters, 2000. – p. 96).

Soloviev on Salvation: The Story of the "Short Story of the Antichrist" (1996),¹¹⁴ but I will focus on the problem of form.

Solovyov brings together several positions, and the author (narrator) in *Three Conversations* admits that "the General and the Politician are both right in the light of a higher truth; and I could with complete sincerity place myself in the position of either one or the other".¹¹⁵ Sergei Solovyov says of this: "Solovyov speaks directly on behalf of Mr. Z., and hides his face behind the masks of the General and Politician. It is obvious that he sympathizes with the first, while the second repeats whole pages from *The Justification of the Good* and *The National Problem in Russia*".¹¹⁶ According to Kornblatt, critics assert that "Solovyov stands behind the views of Mr. Z. (in fact, they often assert that he is Mr. Z.). Occasionally they acknowledge Solovyov's recognition of the relative truth of the positions of the Politician and the General".¹¹⁷ This is a general assessment of how the author's position is represented in *Three Conversations*. I am not going to challenge this account, but I would like to add several remarks about how it works out in the first dialogue, where "the pivotal role belongs to the old general", experienced in fighting, who represents "a religious conception of everyday

¹¹⁴ Kornblatt J. *Soloviev on Salvation* // Kornblatt J. D. and Gustafson R. / Editors/ *Russian Religious Thought*—London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. — pp. 68–87. Adrian Helleman gives an account of *A Short Story of the Antichrist* in his article *Solov'ev's Views on Protestantism* // Bercken W. van den, de Courten M., van der Zweerde E. *Vladimir Solov'ev: Reconciler and Polemicist. Selected Papers of the International Vladimir Solov'ev Conference held at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in September 1998*—Leuven: Peeters, 2000. — pp. 95–105.

¹¹⁵ Solovyov V. *War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ*—Hudson, New York: Lindsfarne Press, 1990. — p. 21. (Соловьёв В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2—М.: Мысль, 1988. — С. 640).

¹¹⁶ Соловьёв С.М. Владимир Соловьёв. Жизнь и творческая эволюция—М.: Республика, 1997. — С.386. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*). Semyon Frank thought that "the chief characters are "the general," representing the morality of the military class, "the prince," representing Tolstoi's theory, "the politician," representing the standpoint of *Realpolitik*, and Mr. Z., who expound Solovyov's own ideas". (*A Solovyov Anthology* / Arranged by S.Frank, translated by N. Duddington/—London: SCM Press Ltd., 1950. — p. 254).

¹¹⁷ Kornblatt J. *Soloviev on Salvation* // Kornblatt J. D. and Gustafson R. / Editors/ *Russian Religious Thought*—London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. — p. 72.

life”.¹¹⁸ The General’s interlocutors, Mr. Z., the Politician and the Prince (“who rather transparently represents Tolstoi”¹¹⁹), encourage him to tell his “chilling war story”,¹²⁰ which is the center of the first dialog. This story is the only part of the dialogue in which a participant (a narrator, the General) is “quite serious”¹²¹ and emphasizes the fact that he is serious. The rest of dialogue is full of puns and jokes; even during moments of intense discussion the personages do not miss a chance to demonstrate their wit. So I conclude that there is a discursive element, based on conversational skills, and an element of irony, as a basic critical instrument.

First of all, the conversation is a genteel, upper class table-talk, and, secondly, there is a biographical element connected with a number of discussions between Solovyov and Tolstoi on topics close to those mentioned in the *Three Conversations* – Tolstoi’s adoption of the “simple life”, the question of the resurrection of Christ,¹²² the problem of the Kingdom of God.¹²³ Mochulsky has left a detailed account of these elements.¹²⁴ This is the discussion at the very end of the first conversation which was mentioned by S.Solovyov, Mochulsky, Kornblatt, and others, and which the Prince lost, leaving him to say in the end: “I refuse to fence with you (Mr. Z.) in a duel

¹¹⁸ Solovyov V. *War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ* – Hudson, New York: Lindsfarne Press, 1990. – p. 20 (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 640).

See: Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция – М.: Республика, 1997. – С.386. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*).

¹¹⁹ Kornblatt J. *Soloviev on Salvation* // Kornblatt J. D. and Gustafson / Editors/ *Russian Religious Thought* – London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. – p. 72.

¹²⁰ Ibid. p. 74.

¹²¹ Solovyov V. *War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ* – Hudson, New York: Lindsfarne Press, 1990. – p. 52. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 660).

¹²² Соловьев В.С. Письма (под. ред. Э.Л.Радлова), в 4-х т., Т.3 – СПб.: Общественная польза, Время, 1908–1923. – С. 38–42. (Solovyov V. *Letters*, in 4 vols.).

¹²³ Осипова Л.Ф. К вопросу об эволюции эсхатологических концепций В.Соловьева // Вестник московского университета, № 3 – М.: МГУ, 1972. – С. 72. (Osipova L. *The Evolution of V.Solovyov’s Eschatological Conception* // *Messenger of Moscow State University*, № 3, 1972).

¹²⁴ Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М.: Республика, 1995. – С. 204–205. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*).

of words, just as I refuse to engage in combat with the General, using for weapons his "Christ-loving" swords".¹²⁵ It is interesting to notice that the Prince wanted to say "something strong enough to flatten his opponent at a blow, and without fencing at all, but the bells of a neighboring church struck the hour of seven".¹²⁶ The church bells scared the demons away. If the Prince's (in fact, Lev Tolstoi's) teaching can be "exposed as the Anti-Christ's lie" in *Three Conversations*, we may note an allusive connection between the Prince and evil spirits.¹²⁷ Kornblatt's article accounts for many jokes, implicit and explicit quotations, and allusions.¹²⁸ She has drawn the conclusion that "Solovyov returned to Plato to find a new expression for divine and human reconciliation, and thus for salvation in terms of "bogochelovechestvo". At the same time, he experimented with conversation, argument, and laughter: a humorous anecdote to parody a serious genre, a joke for the true story; fantastic reality for that which is simply, but not simplistically, real".¹²⁹ I would like to back up Kornblatt's statement

¹²⁵ Solovyov V. *War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ* – Hudson, New York: Lindsfarne Press, 1990. – p. 64. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 668).

¹²⁶ Ibid. (Там же).

¹²⁷ Mochulsky, p. 205. Although I must say that all allusions and associations between the Prince and the Anti-Christ in the text are rather incidental. For example, at the beginning of the third dialogue, in which the end of history and the Anti-Christ were going to be the center of discussion, the Prince walks away, and the Lady just says to him: "Go home to your work now, and return toward the end of the discussion – after the Anti-Christ". While the reading of *A Short Story of the Anti-Christ* was in progress and the Anti-Christ had to confess Jesus Christ's name, and he "completely lost his equilibrium", the Prince walked away again, and the General exclaimed later: "I bet he ran away – ran away a second time! He mastered himself the first time and came back, but this was too much for the poor fellow. He couldn't stand it". Undoubtedly, such a sensitive and subtle writer as Lev Tolstoi could not overlook these associations of his *alter ego*, the Prince, with the Anti-Christ in Solovyov's text.

¹²⁸ For example: "We have a story from the cronicles, with much comment about style (is it or is it not vulgar?), a chilling war story; an anecdote from contemporary life about the death of a wruter that includes the story of another character, the wonderer, hal-iurodivyi Varsonofius. The latter himself is turned into narrator, as Mr. Z. relates a story about yet another character, a European-educated woman, who had been told "a story from the life of ancient hermits" by Varsonofius that Mr. Z. now summarizes". (See Kornblatt, pp.74) "Is the monk (Pansofius, I.S.) then not a parodic combination of Solov'iev's most dearly held mystical beliefs: all-unity (*vseedinstvo*) and Divine Wisdom (*Sophia*)?" (Ibid., p.76).

¹²⁸ Ibid. p. 74.

¹²⁹ Ibid. p. 84.

with results of the analysis of the tropes Solovyov used. I will account for tropes she does not analyze.

In the first dialogue, several ideological positions are represented by the personages: “a religious conception of everyday life” – the General; “a second standpoint, representing the ideas of culture and progress, prevailing in our time” – the Politician; “the third standpoint which is absolutely religious and which will yet show its decisive value in the future, is indicated in the Third Conversation in the speeches of Mr. Z. and in the story by Father Pansofius”.¹³⁰ Apart from this, however, there are two levels of narration, to be distinguished: the serious and sincere (the General’s inquiry about “a *Christ-loving and glorious Russian Army*” and the “chilling story” as his confirmation that only once in his life was he “not guided by any doubtful motive, but solely by the impulse of good that overcame”¹³¹), and the other, the light table-talk (although about very profound issues, emphasized in the title of *Three Conversations*). The ironic style, full of play on words, dominates the conversation, and sometimes penetrates into the General’s story as well, especially when he proclaims: “And this good act of mine has been to me till now, and will of course remain so forever, my very best and purest memory. Well, the single good act of mine was a murder, and not a little insignificant murder at that, for in some quarter of an hour I killed over a thousand men”.¹³² Another example of the General’s gloomy joke in the process of telling the story comes when he mentions “an old sergeant an earnest student of the Bible and singularly gifted”. Then, the gift of the sergeant is exaggerated with the remark: “In England he would have become a Prime Minister”. But this is no simple joke. On the contrary, it becomes a very bitter story in the next sentence: “Now he is in Siberia, banished for resisting the authorities when they were shutting up some “old believers” monastery and destroying the tomb of one of their sainted elders”.¹³³ It is an ironical exaggeration

¹³⁰ Solovyov, p. 20. (Там же. С. 640).

¹³¹ Ibid. p. 52. (Там же. С. 660).

¹³² Ibid. (Там же).

¹³³ Ibid. p. 58. (Там же. С. 663) There is a connection between this episode of the *Three Conversations* and the author’s remark in the *Preface*: “The restraints of religious freedom existing in our country cause the greatest pain to my heart, for I see and feel to what a great extent these restrictions bring harm to and impose a burden not only on those whom they directly affect, but mainly on the course of Christianity in Russia, consequently on the Russian nation, and ultimately on the Russian State” (Ibid. p. 18 (Там же. С. 638)). So, in the *Preface*, the author condemns the restraints of religion in Russia in a straightforward manner, on the

turned into a bitter conclusion about the contradictions of Russian life, in comparison with England and other “real” nations, “highly cultured, with great merit to their credits”.¹³⁴

The General expresses contrasting and ironic remarks several times even in the course of his “chilling story”. For example, “the ideal and all but canonized Cossacks all of a sudden prove to be “veritable” brigands”.¹³⁵ After the Prince’s question about the burial of “the enemies whom you had killed in such great numbers”, the General replies: “Thank God, we were able to move further before that carrion had time to remind us of itself”, etc.¹³⁶ In fact, only a few paragraphs of the General’s story are free of skeptical remarks, puns, and jokes. Let us review how humorous elements of the conversation make it more lively and “realistic”.

The Politician is one of the representatives of this dominating “table-talk” style. In comparison with Mr. Z. and the General, who are engaged in a dispute with the Prince about the meaning of war, he seems rather independent. According to S. Solovyov, “we are amazed by the coincidence between the familiar ideas of Solovyov and the credo of the Politician (i.e. skeptic and atheist): “where religion is involved, never expect any good”. ”¹³⁷ In what is probably the most obvious contrast in the whole book, the Politician “repeats whole pages of *The Justification of the Good*” and, at the same time, has “no objection to resuming the discussion, but only on the condition that religion is kept out of it as much as possible”.¹³⁸ Why does Solovyov put his ideas in the mouth of a skeptic, indifferent to religious questions?

There may be several answers, including 1) the statement that *Three Conversations* is a realistic artistic work, and the logic of realism requires that the Politician should be a cautious skeptic, just as the general should speak in a straightforward manner. 2) But it is not only an artistic work, and Solovyov here proclaims ideas close to those he worked out in *The Justification of the Good*, especially in its Chapter, *The Significance of War*.

condition that these restraints affect and impose a burden “ultimately on the Russian state”. Further, the author comes back to this problem in the case of the “singularly gifted” sergeant showing the typical fate of talented people who challenge an obsolete state order. It is rather an appeal to the authority in an attempt to influence them through literature.

¹³⁴ Ibid. p. 108. (Там же. С. 699).

¹³⁵ Ibid. p. 59. (Там же. С. 698).

¹³⁶ Ibid. p. 60. (Там же. С. 664).

¹³⁷ Ibid. p. 117. (Там же. С. 706).

¹³⁸ Ibid. (Там же).

These hypothetical answers have a common dominant feature, namely that Solovyov felt it necessary to influence life in Russia more directly and to speak with a clearer language (condemnation of “the restraints of religious freedom” in the *Preface* is one such attempt). Since his “disappointment in theocracy, which occurred several years later after his work *La Russie et l'église universelle* (1889) was published”,¹³⁹ he became a close friend of influential people like prince Eduard Ukhtomsky, prince Aleksei Obolensky, the princes Yevgeni and Sergei Trubetskoi, the editor of *Vestnik Evropy* (*European Messenger*) Mikhail Stasyulevich, and others.¹⁴⁰ Losev writes about this serious change in his circle of friends,¹⁴¹ who were liberals and Westernizers; the language of Solovyov's theocratic doctrine was not very clear to them. Losev, who had a thorough discussion with Y. Trubetskoi about the contradictions in Solovyov, caused by his “disappointment in theocracy”, came to the optimistic conclusion regarding Solovyov's vision of theocracy: “It is impossible to say that he quit his theocratical ideas absolutely and finally. His disappointment relates rather to an opportunity

¹³⁹ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 431 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

¹⁴⁰ Mezhyuev writes in his article “Вл. С. Соловьев и петербургское общество 1890-х годов” (Mezhuyev B. *VI. Solovyov and St. Petersburg's Society of the 1890s* /) about Solovyov's friendship with several Russian influential officials and politicians, using as witness Nikolai Engelgart. Engelgart writes: Solovyov chose for his stay the hotel “Angleter”, because there he was surrounded by the highest establishments of the Empire: the State Council in the Mariinsky Palace, the Senate, and the Holy Synod. The editorial office of *Vestnik Evropy* was nearby in Galernaya Street. The members of these establishments, high-profile people, turned up at the philosopher's place during the breaks or after the sessions. They informed him about different undertakings, and discussed events at the top of society. The ex-professor in disgrace was respected by and made friendship with the most educated officials, he was listened to. He thought that he could influence the policy of the country”. (Енгельгарт Н.А. Эпизоды моей жизни // Минувшее., Т. 24 – СПб., 1998 – С.30) (Engelgart N. *Episodes of My Life // The Past*). Mezhyuev calls Solovyov's political *credo* of that time “Liberal-imperial”. (Межуев Б.В. Вл. С. Соловьев и петербургское общество 1890-х годов // Соловьевский сборник. Материалы международной конференции “В.С. Соловьев и его философское наследие” 28–30 августа 2000 /под редакцией И.В. Борисовой, А.П. Козырева/ – М.: Философия-Герменевтика, 2001. – С. 409. (Mezhuyev B. *VI. Solovyov and St. Petersburg's Society of the 1890s // Solovyov Collection. Selected Papers of the International Conference “Vladimir Solovyov and his Philosophical Heritage” held in Moscow, August 28 – 30.* /Edited by I. Borisova, A. Kozurev/)).

¹⁴¹ Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 93. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

to realize the theocratic ideal immediately and fully. Undoubtedly, that ideal remained untouched, but the influence of harsh reality drove it to depths of his mind. In fact, in his works the philosopher had to talk in a more positive language, which also differs in its content from the theocratic constructions of the previous years".¹⁴²

This necessity to speak in a more clear and positive language made Solovyov divide his ideas between Mr. Z. and the Politician. Speaking in Losev's language, Mr. Z. and his "absolutely religious" standpoint represent the depths of Solovyov's mind, while the Politician verbalizes the practical "liberal-imperial" position of an educated Westernizer (to whom Solovyov was close at that time, while remaining, in the depths of his mind, at the religious standpoint) who demonstratively distances himself from the religious vision of concrete social problems. Solovyov expresses the Politician's feelings by an oxymoron: "for God's sake, let us have as little of it (religion, I.S.) as we can!" And the Lady comments: "Your "for God's sake" is very sweet in this connection".¹⁴³

We must take into account an argument in favor of the "realistic reconstruction" as well, namely that such an image of the Politician might correspond to the real politicians Solovyov frequently met in the 1890s.

In concluding this section, I would like to mention briefly the advantages of the dialogue form used by Solovyov in his last major work. In the first lines of *Three Conversations*, Solovyov sets up a discussion about a universal question: Is *evil* a natural defect, an imperfection disappearing with the growth of the good, or is it a real *power*, ruling our world by means of temptations, so that to fight it successfully assistance must be found in another sphere of being?"¹⁴⁴ The dialogue form gives him an opportunity to appeal to a very broad audience, from the traditional reader of his philosophical works, interested mostly in religious questions, to liberals with potentially different points of view on religion. It provided a more flexible form for expressing his liberal and eschatological ideas in one and the same text. It allowed him to show the weakness of Tolstoi's doctrine by artistic means. He left to his *alter ego*, Mr. Z., the polemics with the

¹⁴² Ibid. p. 433. (Там же. С. 433).

¹⁴³ Solovyov V. *War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ* — Hudson, New York: Lindsfarne Press, 1990. — p. 64. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 — М.: Мысль, 19888. — С. 688).

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. p.15. (Там же. С. 433).

Prince from the “absolutely religious standpoint”, but the final triumph over the Prince is shared by all personages of *Three Conversations*.

3.7. Conclusions

The project of narrative analysis is preferably limited to a separate text. That is why I have not gone further into the inquiry of many of Solovyov’s philosophical works; some of these problems might well serve as the themes of separate monographs or articles.

Moreover, the concept of “text” is complicated.¹⁴⁵ The word “text” has several meanings, and the concrete text of a work (e.g. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* or *Lectures on Divine Humanity*) is not limited to the text by Solovyov as a group of his works, or his philosophy as a whole. This is not the place for a discussion about whether Solovyov’s philosophical works, poetry, and *publicistika* are a group of texts with different foci, or, on the contrary, constitute one single text. I have limited myself to the most difficult texts (in my opinion) from the viewpoint of narrative analysis: Solovyov’s early academic works. To some extent, the major non-academic works like *Plato’s Life Drama* or the *Three Conversations* offer a better basis for textual research, and a researcher might expect much more interesting discoveries from such texts which are not even considered to be purely philosophical, especially, the *Three Conversations*. It would just be a technical question applying the literary method of narrative analysis to an originally “half-literary text” (from the point of view of that time, which is not a criterion of “literariness” in the 21st century), such as *La Sophia* or *A Short Story of the Anti-Christ*.

In this concluding section, I would like to summarize briefly the results of my research in this chapter. The approach which I have attempted to apply in this study has allowed me to uncover a new aspect of Solovyov’s philosophy, one that has not been acknowledged well in the history of philosophy, probably because most of the philosophical texts are, as Gracia puts it, “sufficiently straightforward and devoid of literary embellishments and complexities that it is possible to understand their main conceptual

¹⁴⁵ And “the text is open *ad infinitum*: no reader, no subject, no science can exhaust the text. Our goal is ultimately to conceive, to imagine, to live the plurality of the text, the open-endedness of its significance”. (Barthes R. *Textual Analysis of a Tale of Poe // On Signs* /Edited by Marshall Blonsky/ – Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985. – p. 84).

thrust without much knowledge of literary criticism”.¹⁴⁶ For the rudimentary purposes of “school” knowledge it is often enough to know the main ideas of philosophers, and some historical data. But in the cases of Plato, Nietzsche, Solovyov, Sartre, and other great philosophers (who did embellish their philosophical works) the approach of narrative analysis is helpful for investigating well-known texts from an additional, different perspective. Moreover, it can be helpful even from an educational point of view, because students often do not know much about the context, or settings of the text they read, and narrative findings might be useful in this respect.

¹⁴⁶ Gracia J.J.E. *Philosophy and Its History. Issues in Philosophical Historiography* – Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. – p. 261.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The narrative approach is well known in the context of literary studies, but is still *terra nova* for research within traditional philosophy (and Solovyov's philosophy is classical and traditional in the European sense). In my study, I initiate a new approach for the study of philosophical texts in general, and for Russian philosophy in particular. At the same time, my purpose has been to insert this new approach into the existing tradition of Solovyov studies as a supplementary (additional) approach focused on the formal component of any text to be analyzed.

As a result of this work we have learned that close reading allows us to focus on the artistic and rhetorical elements of Solovyov's philosophical text, and to evaluate their role in it. It provides a new perspective in additional studies of some famous works in philosophy. As I said in section 1.6, the influence of these works can be attributed, to a certain extent, to their formal components, not only to the argumentative content and novelty of ideas.

The major achievement of my work is that I have elaborated and applied the scheme of narrative analysis based on close reading, and re-reading of a philosophical text. This scheme (model) provides a new perspective and vision on the system of arguments, concepts and elaborations in a traditional philosophical text.

To summarize in a few words what I have done in this work, I have discovered many supplementary features of Solovyov's writing and philosophical style. In chapter 1, I have provided the basis for the possibility of narrative inquiry. I have worked toward a better understanding of those brilliant works within Russian philosophy whose influence cannot be ascribed only to novel ideas or re-arrangement of known ideas. The narrative element is particularly significant in several of Solovyov's works.

The central question addressed is that of the kind of artistic whole actually faced when we read a book like *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, or another work by Solovyov. In section 1.3 I have analyzed the history of works about Solovyov and noted several works which discuss the narrative element. I claim that the narrative component has to be taken into account in any study of Solovyov. In section 1.4 I have analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of the narrative approach, and have come to the conclusion that it has to be used in addition to a long tradition of historico-philosophical inquiry of authors, like Solovyov, whose works have literary value too.

I started chapter 2 with a history of the study on *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, and have come to the conclusion that the details of the content and the form in which this content was expressed have not yet been studied. So I have delved more deeply into Solovyov's "tropics of discourse".

In section 2.2 I have described the dramatic composition of *The Crisis* and have come to the conclusion that it is built like a classical drama with a long *Vorgeschichte* (Introduction and the first Chapter) which is structured in accordance with a scheme of a syllogism (which itself appears only in the fifth chapter of *The Crisis*). There is another dramatic element: the prolonged action of von Hartman's struggle "to transform Schopenhauer's doctrine, removing its one-sidedness".¹

In section 2.4 I have analyzed Solovyov's concept of the history of philosophy, and have come to the conclusion that Solovyov's account of the history of European philosophy can be called eschatological (in Gracia's sense) and retrospective (in Passmore's sense). Solovyov's synthetic approach to the history of European philosophy can be judged to represent the organicist type of argumentation, according to White's classification of types of argumentation in history.

Solovyov's overall perspective in historico-philosophical narrative, namely his belief that philosophy in the sense of an abstract, exclusively theoretical knowledge has reached the end of its development, leads to the final compositional device of "the realization of the universal synthesis of science, philosophy, and religion".² It is close to the Hegelian vision of the history of philosophy, with the important difference that Solovyov himself placed Hegel's philosophy within the context of the development of rationalism.

The functions of personages from European philosophy as cultural heroes of the narrative have been described in section 2.4. I have compared Solovyov's accounts of central figures of European rationalism with their roles in several well-known histories of philosophy, and found that Solovyov's narrative is determined by his critical attitude to European rationalism.

In section 2.5 I described the functions of some personages within the novelistic narration. My conclusion was that the logic of narration in the

¹ Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute/ Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – p. 86. (Соловьев В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 69).

² Ibid. p. 149. (Там же. С. 122).

chapters of *The Crisis* follows the author's general critical attitude to European rationalism, although the personages of this narration are not limited by this scheme.

Section 2.6 reveals the important role of an individual (a philosopher) in the text. The philosophical portrait of Schopenhauer, as it appears in *The Crisis*, was described there. The term "portrait" characterizes Solovyov's special attitude to Schopenhauer's philosophy. Solovyov sensed the signs of revival of religious metaphysics in his philosophy, and this gave him a very important turn in developing the plot of *The Crisis* to an optimistic end.

In the sections which follows I have focused on textual devices in Solovyov's work, namely points of view, metaphors, questions, ironic remarks, and the permanent motif. In section 2.7 examined the cohesive role of parallelisms and comparisons as they help the author to emphasize the similarities between different philosophical systems. The parallels between philosophers and doctrines (scholasticism and rationalism: Erigena is the first thinker, Descartes is the first modern philosopher; individuals in Schopenhauer, and individual modes in Spinoza; Hegel's "purely logical" philosophy and Comte's empiricism, materialism and empiricism, etc.) introduce new knowledge, in the sense that the relationship between participants of the philosophical process become clarified; these rhetoric devices also make the narrative more impressive.

In section 2.8 I have described features of the author's images in the text, and the situations in which they appear: the "Author-Describer" and the "Author-Orator". I have also analyzed the episode in which the author of *The Crisis* overcomes the rules of an academic style of dissertation. In section 2.9 I have outlined the artistic role of comparisons and of some other devices (like the addition "so-called" to positivism, the confirmation of a positivist view by the end of the Introduction) in Solovyov's account of positivism. Section 2.10 shows how important ironic remarks were for Solovyov's critique of positivism. Irony comes to the text through the *reductio ad absurdum*, oxymoron, and hyperbolization of Comte's and Mill's theses. The rhetorical element goes hand in hand with rational arguments against positivism. By means of rhetorical devices the author backs up his arguments "against the positivists". So, the rhetorical form has become an inalienable part of the author's concept.

In section 2.11 I have briefly described how the personages of the narrative refer to Kant's idea of *Ding an sich*. The main characters in Solovyov's narrative try to identify themselves in connection with this ghost of *Ding un sich*. The positivist philosophers, in the author's opinion,

pretend to “admit a knowability of the absolutely unknowable”. This last oxymoron helps with an exposure of the weaknesses of positivism in *The Crisis*.

Section 2.12 describes different types of metaphors in the text: *a plot-forming metaphor* – the crisis of philosophy; *a philosophical metaphor* – one-sidedness; *a methodological metaphor* – the first principle. There are several *descriptive metaphors*, e.g. the attributes in Descartes or “the empirical domain” in dogmatic metaphysics.

In section 2.13 I have classified the questions in the text: the author’s inquiries to the characters and the author’s questions to the reader. The questions are mostly a feature of the novelistic type of narration in *The Crisis*. My conclusion is that the questions articulate the philosophical pathos of the text, and make the text livelier.

In section 2.14 the central theme was the representation of the historical in *The Crisis*. I have analyzed the text from the point of view of types of emplotment, and modes of argumentation. I have highlighted two mythopoetical components of the text – the end of philosophical development, and the transfiguration of philosophy that has to come back to its roots. Solovyov used three ways of emplotment in the text, namely the mythological, chronicle, and novelistic.

In chapter 3 I have drawn the reader’s attention to some narrative elements of Solovyov’s texts, such as key ideas or centers of narration in several works, the use of triadic schemes in *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*, etc. In sections 3.1 and 3.2 I have examined the remarks of several scholars on Solovyov’s major works, and have pointed out the key ideas or centers of narration of these works. In his major works Solovyov looked at everything “from the point of view of eternity” and answers question about “the purpose of all that exists”. His narration is set up from the universal Christian perspective which he called “All-unity” and outlined in its clearest form in *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge* and *A Critique of Abstract Principles*.

In section 3.3 I analyzed Solovyov’s use of triadic schemata in *The Philosophical Principles*. He used them sometimes without any rational explanation, leaving the impression that he misused triadic schemes. The author smooths the serenity of triadic constructions with the use of Christian theological terms, confirming them by quotations from the New Testament. The reader is expected to follow the logic of triadic constructions almost uncritically; if there is any doubt the narrative would lose its persuasiveness.

Section 3.4 is devoted to the tropes and stylistic devices in the *Lectures on Divine Humanity*. I have explained how the lectures format affects the style and elements of narration like the usage of relevant and modern terminology (especially from socialism and the scientific world-view). I have described the figure of gradation, which allows the author to mask the introduction of the concept of God in a very progressive and scientific-like manner.

In section 3.5 I have examined the authoritative role of Hegel as a philosopher *par excellence*, although, in Solovyov's opinion, his philosophy has "fallen". He valued Hegel's dialectics, but thought that his panlogicism represented an extreme in the history of philosophy, a sign of one-sidedness (the argument used by Hegel is applied to Hegel himself) which, in turn, leads to absurdity, colossal nonsense, and "a thinking where nothing is thought".

In section 3.6 I analyzed the forms of dialogue in Solovyov's *Three Conversations* at the level of discourse, and found that the author had to put his ideas to the personage whose world-view is completely different from Solovyov's own: the Politician, an atheist and skeptic. Apart from a device of realistic "reconstruction" of dialogue (the author claims that he tried to "reconstruct" the conversation, "being afraid to compose it out of his own head after the model of Plato and his imitators",³) the author uses the Politician's manner of speech in order to reach the broader audience and to make the philosophical ideas expressed in a language as positive and as secular as he could.

The present work has highlighted several more topics and themes for further development and exploration, such as the role of the same plots, tropes, and poetic devices in other major works of Solovyov that have been left unmentioned. The narrative approach is always possible, and applicable to texts from Russian classical philosophy and philosophical texts in general. It must be present and taken into account as a supplementary perspective in any study of philosophy.

³ Solovyov V. *War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ* – Hudson, New York: Lindsfarne Press, 1990. – p. 30 ((Соловьёв В.С. Сочинения, в 2-х т., Т. 2 – М.: Мысль, 1988. – С. 644)).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ankersmit F.R. *History and Tropology. The Rise and Fall of Metaphor* – Berkeley, University of California Press, 1994. – 244 p.
2. Arnold E. /Editor/ *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory* – London, New York: Edward Arnold, 1992. – 329 p.
3. *A Solovyov Anthology* /Arranged by S.Frank, translated by N. Duddington/ – London: SCM Press Ltd., 1950. – 260 p.
4. Bakhtin M. *The Dialogic Imagination by M. Bakhtin. Four Essays* /Edited by M. Holquist/ – Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. – 443 p.
5. Bakhtin M. *Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics* /Translated by Rotset R./ – Ardis, 1973. – 249 p.
6. Bakhtin M. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* /Translated by Vern W. Mc Gee/ – Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. – 178 p.
7. Baldick C. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. – 246 p.
8. Barthes R. *Analyse textuelle d'un conte d'Edgar Poe // Sémiotique narrative et textuelle*. Paris, 1973. – 29–54 pp.
9. Barthes R. *Barthes to the Third Power // On Signs* / Edited by Marshall Blonsky/ – Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985. – 189–191 pp.
10. Barthes R. *Elements of Semiology* /Translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith/ – New York: The Noonday Press, 1992. – 111 p.
11. Barthes R. *S/Z* – Paris, Edition du Seuil, 1970. – 280 p.
12. Barthes R. *Textual Analysis of a Tale of Poe // On Signs* /Edited by Marshall Blonsky/ – Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985. – 85–97 pp.
13. Barthes R. *Writing Degree Zero* /Translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith/ – New York: The Noonday Press, 1967. – 88 p.
14. Bercken W. van den, de Courten M., van der Zweerde E. *Vladimir Solov'ev: Reconciler and Polemicist. Selected Papers of the International Vladimir Solov'ev Conference held at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in September 1998* – Leuven: Peeters, 2000. – 490 p.
15. Berlin I. *Russian Thinkers* – London: The Hogarth Press, 1979. – 312 p.
16. Beck L. W. *Introduction and Bibliography // The Monist: an International Quarterly Journal of General Philosophical Inquiry*, vol. 53, № 4 – La Salle: Hegeler Institute, 1969. – 523–531 pp.

17. Bremont C. *La logique des possibles narratifs* // *Communications*, 8. *L'analyse structurale du récit* – Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – 66–82 pp.
18. Bulgakov S. *Sophia. The Wisdom of God* – New York, Lindsfarne Press, 1993. – 156 p.
19. Burke K. *A Rhetoric of Motives* – Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1950. – 340 p.
20. Burke K. *Language as Symbolic Action. Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* – Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966. – 514 p.
21. Burke K. *The Philosophy of Literary Form. Studies in Symbolic Action* – New York: Vintage Books, 1957. – 330 p.
22. Butler C. *Interpretation, Deconstruction, and Ideology. An Introduction to Some Current Issues in Literary Theory* – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984. – 159 p.
23. Campbell P. *Poetic-Rhetorical, Philosophical, and Scientific Discourse* // *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, Vol.6, № 1 – Pennsylvania State University Press, 1973. – 1–30 pp.
24. Cascardi A. /Editor/ *Literature and the Question of Philosophy* – Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1987. – 333 p.
25. Châtelet F. *La question de l'histoire de la philosophie aujourd'hui* // *Politiques et la philosophie* /edited by D.Grisoni/ – Paris: Grasset, 1976. – 31–53 pp.
26. Chklovski V. *Comment est fait "Don Quichotte"?* // Chklovski V. *Sur la théorie de la prose*. /Traduit du russe par Guy Verret/ – Éditions l'Age d'Homme, Lausanne, 1973. – 107–145 pp. (Further in this bibliography, you can see the English version of Chklovski's name – Shklovsky – in the title of one book).
27. Cioran S. *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Knighthood of the Divine Sophia* – Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1977. – 210 p.
28. Collins J. *A History of Modern European Philosophy* – Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1954. – 854 p.
29. Cooper N. *Secret Truths and Unheard-of Women: Poliksena Solov'eva's Fiction as Commentary on Vladimir Solov'ev's Theory of Love* // *The Russian Review*. An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present – The Ohio State University Press, vol. 56, Oct. 1997. – 178–191 pp.
30. Copleston F. *A History of Philosophy*, in 9 vols. – New York: Image Books, 1985.

31. Copleston F. *On the History of Philosophy and Other Essays* – London: Search Press, 1979. – 445 p.
32. Copleston F. *Philosophy in Russia. From Herzen to Lenin and Berdyaev* – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986. – 445 p.
33. Corr C. A. *Toward an Improved Understanding of the History of Philosophy // Metaphilosophy*, vol. 6, № 1, 1975. – 54–71 pp.
34. Corti M. *An Introduction to Literary Semiotics* /Translated by Margherita Bogat and Allen Mandelbaum/ – Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1978. – 176 p.
35. Coulthard M. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* – New York: Longman, 1985. – 212 p.
36. Cuddon J. A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms* – Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991. – 1051 p.
37. Culler J. *Structuralist Poetics. Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature* – Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1975. – 301p.
38. Dahm H. *Vladimir Solovyev and Max Scheler: Attempt at a Comparative Interpretation. A Contribution to the History of Phenomenology* /Translated from the German by Kathleen Wright/ – Dordrecht-Hollnad/Boston-USA: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1975. – 325 pp.
39. Davidson P. *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Ideal of Prophecy // The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 78, № 4 – Maney Publishing, 2000. – 643–670 pp.
40. Derrida J. *Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences // Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader* /Edited by David Lodge/ – London and New York: Longman, 1988. – 122 p.
41. Derrida J. *Writing and Difference* – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. – 342 p.
42. Dzhimbinov S. *The Return of Russian Philosophy // Russian Thought After Communism. The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage* /Edited by P.Scanlan/ – Armonk and London, M.E. Sharpe, 1994. – 11–22 pp.
43. Eades T. *Plato, Rhetoric and Silence // Philosophy and Rhetoric*, vol. 29, № 3 – The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996. – 244–258 pp.
44. Easthope A. *British Post-structuralism since 1968* – London and New York: Routledge, 1988. – 235 p.
45. Eco U. *The Role of the Reader. Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* – Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press, 1979. – 273 p.
46. Emmott C. *Narrative Comprehension. A Discourse Perspective* – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. – 320 p.
47. Fadner F. *Seventy Years of Pan-Slavism in Russia. Karamzin to Danilevskii, 1800–1870* – Haarlem: Georgetown University Press, 1962. – 429 p.

48. Fischer K. *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie*, in 10 vols., 5th edition – Heidelberg: Karl Winter's Buchandlung, 1912.
49. Foucault M. *L'archéologie du savoir* – Paris: Gallimard, 1969. – 275 p.
50. Genette G. *Fiction and Diction* /Translated by Catherine Porter/ – Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1993. – 155 p.
51. Gossman L. *Between History and Literature* – Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990. – 412 p.
52. Gossman L. *The Empire Unpossess'd. An Essay on Gibbon's "Decline and Fall"* – Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981. – 160 p.
53. Gracia J.J.E. *Philosophy and Its History. Issues in Philosophical Historiography* – Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. – 387 p.
54. Graham G. *Can there be History of Philosophy? // History and Theory*, № 11 – The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1982. – 37–52 pp.
55. Gray B. *The Grammatical Foundation of Rhetoric. Discourse Analysis* – The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1977. – 357 p.
56. Greimas A.J. *Éléments pour une théorie de l'interprétation de récit mythique // Communications*, № 8. *L'analyse structurale du récit* – Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1981. – 34–65 pp.
57. Greimas A. and Courtes J. *Semiotics and Language. An Analytical Dictionary* – Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982. – 409 p.
58. Greimas A. *Structural Semantics. An Attempt at a Method* – Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1983. – 325 p.
59. Groberg K.A. *Vladimir Sergeievich Solovy'ev. A Bibliography*.
60. Groden M. and Kreiswirth M. /Editors/ *The John Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism* – Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1989. – 775 p.
61. Guérout M. *The History of Philosophy As a Philosophical Problem // The Monist: An International Quarterly Journal of General Philosophical Inquiry*, vol. 53, № 4 – La Salle: Hegeler Institute, 1969. – 563–587 pp.
62. Guibert F.-X. de /Éditeur/ *Œcuménisme et Eschatologie selon Soloviev* – Paris: Sagesse chrétienne, 1994. – 181p.
63. Gustafson R. *Soloviev's Doctrine of Salvation // Russian Religious Thought* – London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. – 31–47 pp.
64. Handwerk G. *Irony and Ethics in Narrative. From Schlegel to Lacan* – New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1954. – 231 p.
65. Harari J. /Editor/ *Textual Strategies. Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* – Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1979. – 475 p.
66. Hawkes T. *Structuralism and Semiotics* – London: Methuen & Co, 1977. – 192 p.

67. Hartshorne C. *Insights and Oversights of Great Thinkers. An Evolution of Western Philosophy* – Albany: State University of New York, 1983 – 393 p.
68. Herman M. *Vie et œuvre de Vladimir Soloviev. Essai* – Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1995. – 157 p.
69. *Histoire de la philosophie. Idées, doctrines. Sous la direction de François Châtelet*, in 6 vols. /P.Aubenque, J.Bernhardt, F. Châtelet ed./ – Paris: Hachette , 1972.
70. Holland A.J. /Editor/ *Philosophy, its History and Historiography* – Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1983. – 335 p.
71. Hymers M. *Metaphor, Cognitivity, and Meaning-Holism // Philosophy and Rhetoric*, Vol. 31, № 4 – The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996. – 266–282 pp.
72. Jakobson R. *Linguistics and Poetics // Jakobson R. Selected Writings in 5 Vols., Vol. III, Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry* – The Hague: Mouton Press, 1981. – 18–51 pp.
73. Jameson Fr. *The Political Unconscious* – London: Methuen, 1981. – 305 p.
74. Jameson Fr. *The Vanishing Mediator; or, Max Weber as Storyteller // Jameson Fr. The Ideologies of Theory. Essays 1971–1986. vol. 2, Syntax of History* – London: Routledge, 1988. – 3–35 pp.
75. Kayzer W. *Die Anfänge des modernen Romans im 18. Jahrhundert und seine heutige Krise // Deutch Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* – Stuttgart, 1954. – 417–446 S.
76. Kennedy G. A. *A Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* – London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980. – 291 p.
77. Kirby J. *A Classicist's Approach to Rhetoric in Plato // Philosophy and Rhetoric*, vol. 30, № 2 – The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997. – 190–202 pp.
78. Kline G.L. *Hegel and Solovyov // Hegel and the History of Philosophy. Proceedings of the 1972 Hegel Society in America Conference /ed. by J. O'Malley and others/* – The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974. – 159–170 pp.
79. Knigge A. *Die Lyrik Vl.Solov'evs und ihre Nachwirkung bei A.Belyj und A.Blok*, PhD dissertation, University of Kiel, 1972.
80. Kornblatt J. D. and Gustafson /Editors/ *Russian Religious Thought* – London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. – 266 p.
81. Kornblatt J. *Vladimir Solov'ev on Spiritual Nationhood. Russia and the Jews // The Russian Review. An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia Past*

- and Present – The Ohio State university Press, vol. 56, Oct. 1997. – 157–177 p.
82. Kristéva J. *Le texte du roman*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970. – 209 p.
 83. Kristéva J. *The Speaking Subject // On Signs* /Edited by Marshall Blonsky/ – Baltimore, Mariland: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985. – 210–220 pp.
 84. Kuhn T. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971. – 210 p.
 85. Kuvakin V. /Editor/ *A History of Russian Philosophy. From the Tenth Through the Twentieth Centuries*, in 2 vols. – Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1994.
 86. *La Philosophie. Sous la direction de Francois Chetelet*, in 4 vols. – Verviers: Marabout, 1979.
 87. Landau M. *Human Evolution as a Narrative* – American Scientist, № 72, 1984. – 262 p.
 88. Lavine T. and Tejera V. /Editors/ *History and Anti-History in Philosophy* – Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989. – 285 p.
 89. Lemon M.C. *The Discipline of History and the History of Thought* – London and New York: Routledge, 1995. – 280 p.
 90. Lodge D. /Editor/ *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader* – London and New York: Longman, 1988. – 467 p.
 91. Lotman J. *The Structure of the Artistic Text (Michigan Slavic Contribution; № 7)* /Translated from the Russian by Gail Lenhoff and Ronald Vroon/ – Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977. – 300 p.
 92. Lotman Y. *Analysis of the Poetic Text* /Edited and translated by D. Johnson/ – Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1976. – 309 p.
 93. Lyotard J. – Fr. *La condition postmoderne. Rapport sur le savoir* – Paris: les Editions de Minuit, 1979. – 109 p.
 94. Mandelbaum M. *The History of Ideas, Intellectual History, and the History of Philosophy // History and Theory*, № 5: *The Historiography of the History of Philosophy* – The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1965. – 33–66 pp.
 95. Martin W. *Recent Theories of Narrative* – Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986. – 242 p.
 96. Meynet R. *Rhetorical Analysis. An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 256* – Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998. – 386 p.
 97. Miller H. *The Ethics of Reading* – New York: Columbia University Press, 1987. – 138 p.
 98. Miller H. *The Linguistic Moment. From Wordsworth to Stevens* – New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985. – 445 p.

99. Milosz C. *Introduction // Solovyov V. War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ* – Hudson, New York: Lindsfarne Press, 1990. – 7–13 pp.
100. Moss W. *Vladimir Soloviev and the Jews in Russia // The Russian Review. An American Quaterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present*, vol. 29, № 2 – The Ohio State University Press, 1970. – 181–191 pp.
101. Natoli J. /Editor/ *Tracing Literary Theory* – Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987. – 371 p.
102. Nethercott F. *Between Christian Platonism and the “Father of Idealism”: Solovyov as Translator and Interpreter of Plato // Vladimir Solov’ev: Reconciler and Polemist, Eastern Christian Studies* – Leuven: Peeters, 2001. – 251–266 pp.
103. Nethercott F. *Russia’s Plato. Plato and the Platonic Tradition in Russian Education, Science and Ideology (1840–1930)* – Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000. – 233 p.
104. Passmore J. *Philosophy, Historiography of // The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, in 8 vols., vol. 6 – London: The Macmillan Company, 1967. – 226–230 pp.
105. Passmore J. *The Idea of a History of Philosophy // History and Theory*, № 5: *The Historiography of the History of Philosophy* – The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1965. – 1–32 pp.
106. Patrick D. and Scult A. *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 82* – Sheffield: Arnold Press, 1990. – 171 p.
107. Perkins D. *Is Literary History Possible?* – London and Baltimor: The John Hopkins University Press, 1992. – 192 p.
108. Polanyi M. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-critical Philosophy* – London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973. – 428 p.
109. Pollach R. *Vers- und Reimtechnik in den Gedichten V.S. Solov’evs, PhD dissertation* – Tübingen: University of Tübingen, 1983
110. Poulin F. *Vladimir Solov’ev’s Russia i vselenslaya tserkov’, Early Slavophilism’s Pneumatic Spirit, and the Pauline Prophet // The Russian Review. An American Quaterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present*, vol 52, № 4 – The Ohio State University Press, 1993. – 528–539 pp.
111. Pratt M. L. *Towards a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse* – Bloomington & London, 1977. – 236 p.
112. Propp V. *Morphology of the Folk tale* /translated by L.Scott/ – Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958. – 134 p.
113. Randall J.H. *The Career of Philosophy*, in 3 vols., vol. 2 – New York: Columbia University Press, 1965. – 675 p.

114. Ricoeur P. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation* /Edited and translated by J. Thompson/ – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. – 314 p.
115. Ricoeur P. *The Rule of Metaphor. Multy-disciplinary studies of the creation of meaning in language* /Translated by R.Czerny/– London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978. – 384 p.
116. Ricoeur P. *Time and Narrative*, in 3 vols. /Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer/– Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1984.
117. Rosenthal B. /Editor/ *The Occult in Russian and Soviet Culture* – Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1997. – 468 p.
118. Rupp J. *Message ecclésial de Solowiew* – Paris, Bruxelles: Lethielleux et Vie avec Dieu, 1974. – 603 p.
119. Russel B. *A History of Western Philosophy and Its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* – New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945. – 895 p.
120. *Russian Formalism. A Collection of Articles and Texts in Translation* / Edited by Stephen Bann and John Bowlt/ – Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1973. – 178 p.
121. Scanlan P. /Editor/ *Russian Thought After Communism. The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage* – Armonk and London, M.E. Sharpe, 1994. – 238 p.
122. Schacht R. *Classical Modern Philosophers* – London: Routledge & Kean Paul, 1984. – 275 p.
123. Serge C. *Introduction to the Analysis of the Literary Text* /Translated by John Meddemmen/ – Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988. – 337 p.
124. Sherwood R. *Viktor Shklovsky and the Development of Early Formalist Theory of Prose Literature // Russian Formalism. A Collection of Articles and Texts in Translation* /Edited by Stephen Banm and John Bowlt/ – Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1973. – 26–40 p.
125. Shiner L. *The Secret Mirror. Literary Form and History in Tocqueville's Recollections* – Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988. – 199 p.
126. Smart H.R. *Philosophy and its History. A Critical examination of the Permanent Values to Philosophy of its Own History* – La Salle: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1962. – 158 p.
127. Soloviev V. *La Sophia et les autres écrits français* /Édités par François Rouleau/ – Lausanne: L'Age d'Homme, 1978. – 368 p.
128. Solovyov V. *Lectures on Divine Humanity* /Revised and Edited by Boris Jakim/ – Hudson: Lindsfarne Press, 1995. – 188 p.

129. Solovyov V. *Politics, Law, and Morality* /Edited and translated by V.Wozniuk/ – New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000. – 255 p.
130. Solovyov V. *The Crisis of Western Philosophy (Against the Positivists)* / Translated and edited by Boris Yakim/ – Esalen Institute: Lindisfarne Press, 1996. – 191 p.
131. Solovyov V. *The Justification of the Good* – Edinburgh, R. & R. Clark, 1918. – 475 p.
132. Solovyov V. *War, Progress, and the End of History. Three Conversations Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ* – Hudson, New York: Lindisfarne Press, 1990. – 206 p.
133. *Soviet Semiotics. An Anthology* /Edited, translated and with Introduction by D.Lucid/ – Baltimore, London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1977. – 257 p.
134. Stacy R. *Defamiliarization in Language in Literature* – Syracuse University Press, 1977. – 149 p.
135. Steward D. *Metaphor and Paraphrase* // *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, vol. 4, № 2 – Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971. – 111–123 pp.
136. Strémooukhoff D. *Vladimir Soloviev et son oeuvre messianique* – Lausanne, L'Age d'Homme, 1976. – 351 p. (The first publication in French in 1935).
137. Sutton J. *The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov. Towards a Reassessment.* – London: Macmillan Press, 1988. – 247 p.
138. Taylor T.J. *Theorizing Language. Analysis. Normativity. Rhetoric. History* – Amsterdam: Pergamon, 1997. – 271 p.
139. *The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology* – London: Heinemann, 1976. – 307 p.
140. Todorov T. *Poétique de la prose* – Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1971. – 253 p.
141. Todorov T. *The Notion of Literature* // *Genres in Discourse* /Translated by Catherine Porter/ – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. – 1–12 pp.
142. Toinet P. *Vladimir Soloviev. Chevalier de la Sophia* – Genève: Editions Ad Solem, 2001. – 236 p.
143. Vries A. de *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery* – Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1974. – 515 p.
144. Walicki A. *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism* /Translated from the Polish by H.Andrews-Rusiecka/ – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980. – 456 p.

145. Walicki A. *Solov'ëv, Vladimir Sergeevich (1853–1900)* // *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* /General Editor E. Craig/, in 10 vols., vol. 9 – London: Routledge, 1998. – 29–33 pp.
146. Walicki A. *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* – Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989. – 610 p.
147. Walsh W.H. *Hegel on the History of Philosophy* // *History and Theory*, № 5: *The Historiography of the History of Philosophy* – The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1965. – 67–82 pp.
148. White H. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* – London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973. – 448 p.
149. White H. *The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory* // *History and Theory*, № 7. – The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1984. – 1–33 pp.
150. White H. *Tropics of Discourse* – Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1978. – 287 p.
151. White L. *The Science of Culture: a study of Man and Civilization* – New York: Grove Press, 1958 – XX, p. 444)
152. Yakim B. and Bird R. /Translators and editors/ *On Spiritual Unity. A Slavophile Reader* – Hundon: Lindisfarne Books, 1998. – 365 pp.
153. Zweerde E. van der *Reflections on Philosophical Culture* // *Metaphilosophy* /Edited by Murava L./ – St. Petersburg: Eidos, 1997. – 31–54 pp.
154. Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Historiography of Philosophy. Istoriko-Filosofskaja Nauka* – Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997. – 291 p.
155. Zweerde E. van der *Soviet Philosophy – the Ideology and the Handmaid. A Historical and Critical Analysis of Soviet Philosophy, with a Case-Study into Soviet History of Philosophy* – Nijmegen, 1994. – 663 p.
156. Zweerde E. van der *The Normalization of the History of Philosophy in Post-Soviet Russian Philosophical Culture* // *The Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*, vol. XII – Boston: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2001. – 95–104 pp.

TITLES IN RUSSIAN

1. Айхенвальд Ю. И. Владимир Соловьев (Его стихотворения) // Силуэты русских писателей — М.: Республика, 1994. — С. 370–372 (С. 592) (Eichenwald Y. *Vladimir Solovyov (his Poetry)* // *Silhouettes of Russian Writers*).
2. Алексеева И.Ю. Философия в современной России и русская философия // Философы России XIX-XX столетий. Биографии. Идеи. Труды — М.: Академический проект, 1999. — С. 12–14. (Alekseyeva I. *Philosophy in Modern Russia and Russian Philosophy* // *Russian Philosophers of the 19th-20th Centuries. Biographies. Ideas. Works*).
3. Алешин А.И. /Редактор/ Русская философия. Малый энциклопедический словарь — М.: Наука, 1995. — С. 625 (*Russian Philosophy. Encyclopedia*).
4. Асанбаева Г.Д. Гуманизм этики Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук — М., 1990. — С. 174. (Asanbayeva G. *Humanism of Vladimir Solovyov's Ethics*, PhD dissertation).
5. Асмус В.Ф. Владимир Соловьев — М.: Прогресс, 1994. — С. 206. (Asmus V. *Vladimir Solovyov*).
6. Бакрадзе А.Т. Проблема человека в философии В.Соловьева / Критический анализ/: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук — Тбилиси, 1972. — С.204 (Bakradze A. *The Problem of Man in V. Solovyov's Philosophy /Critical Analysis/*, PhD dissertation).
7. Барабанов Е.В. Русская философия и кризис идентичности // Вопросы философии. 1991, № 8. (Barabanov E. *Russian Philosophy and the Crisis of Identity*).
8. Баранов С.Т. Критика социально-политических аспектов философско-религиозной концепции Вл. Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук. — Ставрополь, 1974. — С. 114 (Baranov S. *A Critics of Social and Political Aspects of Vl. Solovyov's Philosophic and Religious Conception*; PhD dissertation).
9. Барковская Е.Ю. Владимир Соловьев: Взгляд на мусульманский мир // Вестник РАН, Т.63, № 10 — М.: Наука, 1993. — С. 913–917. (Barkovskaya E. *Vladimir Solovyov: The View on the Muslim World* // *Vestnik (Messenger) of the Russian Academy of Science*).
10. Барт Р. Введение в структурный анализ повествовательных текстов // Зарубежная эстетика и теория литературы XIX-XX веков: трактаты, статьи, эссе — М.: МГУ, 1987. — С. 387–422. (R.Barthes *Introduction into the Structural Analysis of Narrative Texts*).

11. Барт Р. Избранные работы: семиотика. Поэтика: Пер. с французского / составление, общая редакция и вступительная статья Косикова Г.К. / – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 616. (Barthes R. *Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics*).
12. Барт Р. S/Z – М.: Ad marginem, 1994. – С.303. (R.Barthes S/Z).
13. Бердяев Н.А. Проблема Востока и Запада в религиозном сознании Вл. Соловьева // Сборник статей о Владимире Соловьеве – Брюссель: Жизнь с Богом, 1994. – С. 136–166 (Berdiayev N. *The Problem of the East and the West in Vladimir Solovyov's Religious mind* // *The Collection of Works on Vladimir Solovyov*).
14. Бердяев Н.А. Русская идея. Основные проблемы русской мысли XIX века и начала XX века // О России и русской философской культуре. Философы русского послеоктябрьского зарубежья – М.: Наука, 1990. – С. 43 – 271. (Berdiayev N. *Russian Idea*) The first Russian edition was published in 1946 in Paris.
15. Бойков В.В. Соловьиная песнь русской философии // Владимир Соловьев: *Pro et contra*. Личность и творчество Владимира Соловьева в оценке русских мыслителей и исследователей. Антология – СПб.: Изд-во Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 2000. – С. 1–25. (Boikov V. “*Soloyinaya pesn*” of Russian Philosophy // *Vl. Solovyov: Pro et contra. Personality and Works of Vladimir Solovyov in Works of Russian Thinkers and Researchers* – St. Petersburg: Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute Press, 2000).
16. Болдырев В. И. Глобальные проблемы человечества в “Метафизике всеединства” В. Соловьева // Философия и кризис современной цивилизации – М., 1993. – С. 215–227. (Boldyrev V. *Global Human Problems in Vladimir Solovyov's “Metaphysics of All-unity”* // *Philosophy and the Crisis of Modern Civilization*).
17. Болдырев В.И. Судьба России в философии Вл. Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд филос. наук – М., 1993. – С. 137. (Boldyrev V. *The Fate of Russia in Vl. Solovyov's Philosophy*; PhD dissertation).
18. Бондарев П.Б. Философия истории Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – Краснодар, 1996. – С. 136 (Bondarev P. *Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy of History*, PhD Dissertation).
19. Борисова И.В., Козырев А.П. /Редакторы/ Соловьевский сборник. Материалы международной конференции “В.С. Соловьев и его философское наследие” 28 – 30 августа 2000 – М.: Философия-

- Герменевтика, 2001. — С. 515. (*Solovyov Collection. Selected Papers of the International Conference "Vladimir Solovyov and his Philosophical Heritage" held in Moscow, August 28 — 30. /Edited by I. Borisova, A. Kozyrev/*).
20. Бремонт К. Логика повествовательных возможностей // Семиотика и искусствометрия — М. : Наука, 1972. — С.108—135. French edition: Bremont Claude *Logique des possibles narratifs // Communications*, 8. *L'analyse structurale du récit* — Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1981. — pp. 66—82.
21. Булгаков С.Н. О Соловьеве // Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1999 г. , под ред. М.А.Колерова — М.: ОГИ, 1999. — С. 214—222 (*Research on History of Russian Thought. Yearbook — 1999*).
22. Булгаков С.Н. Свет невечерний — М.: Республика, 1994. — С. 508 (Bulgakov S. *The Unfading Light*) The first Russian edition was published in 1917.
23. Булгаков С.Н. Что дает современному сознанию философия Владимира Соловьева // Книга о Владимире Соловьеве — М.: Советский писатель, 1991. — С. 389) (Bulgakov S. *What Does Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy Give to the Modern Mindset?*) The first Russian edition was published in 1911.
24. Бурмистров К. Владимир Соловьев и Каббала. К постановке проблемы // Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1998 под ред. М.А.Колерова — М.: ОГИ, 1998. — С. 7—105. (Burmistrov K. *To the Problem: Vladimir Solovyov and Kabbala // (Research on History of Russian Thought. Year-book — 1998)*).
25. Бушуров Г.К. Философия В.С. Соловьева \Критический анализ\ Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук — Л., 1973. — С. 219.(Bushurov G. *Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy /Critical Analysis/; PhD Dissertation*).
26. Величко В.Л. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творение — СПб.: 1903. — С. 208. (Velichko V. *Vladimir Solovyov. Life and Works*).
27. Веселовский А.Н. Историческая поэтика — М.: Высшая школа, 1989. — С. 405. (Veselovsky A. *Historical Poetics*) The first Russian edition as *The Three Chapters from Historical Poetics* was published in 1899.
28. Вишневецкий И. Владимир Соловьев как естественный мыслитель // Aequinox — М.: Книжный сад, 1993. — С. 230—236 (Vishnevetsky I. *Vladimir Solovyov as a Natural Thinker // Aequinox*, 1993).
29. Волкогонова О.Д. Образ России в философии русского зарубежья — М.: РОССПЭН, 1998. — С. 325 (Volkogonova O. *The Image of Russia in the Russian Philosophy in the Emigration*).

30. Гараева Г. Софийный идеализм Вл. Соловьева: Сущность и историческая характеристика // Общественные науки, № 2 – М.: Известия вузов. Северо-Кавказский регион, 1999. – С. 63–69 (Garayeva G. *The Sophian Idealism of Vl. Solovyov: Essence and Historical Characterization*).
31. Гегель Г. Лекции по истории философии в 3-х т., т. 1 – СПб.: Наука, 1993. (Hegel F. *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*).
32. Голубев А.Н. Гегель и Вл. Соловьев. Границы идеалистической диалектики // Доклады 10-го международного гегелевского конгресса, вып. 2 – М., 1974. – С.73–87 (Golubev A. *Hegel and Solovyov. The Limits of Idealistic Dialectics* // *Reports of the 10th International Hegel Congress*).
33. Гудков Л.Д. Метафора // Культурология. XX век. Энциклопедия – СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. – С.36 (Gudkov L. *Metaphor* // *Encyclopedia "Cultural Studies. XX Century"*).
34. Гулыга А.В. Русская идея и ее творцы – М.: Молодая гвардия, 1996. – С. 322 (Gulyga A. *Russian Idea and its Creators*).
35. Гулыга А.В. Соловьев и Шеллинг // Историко-философский ежегодник – М.: Наука, 1987. – С. 266–270. (Gulyga A. *Solovyov and Schelling* // *History of Philosophy. Yearbook-87*).
36. Гуревич А.Я. Территория историка // Одиссей. Человек в истории – М., "Coda", 1996. – С. 366. (Gurevich A. *The Territory of a Historian* // *Odyssey. The Human in History*. Collection of Works)).
37. Гутова С.Г. Мистический рационализм в философии всеединства Вл Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – Екатеринбург, 1994. – С.149. (Gutova S., *Mystic Rationalism in Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy of All-Unity*. PhD dissertation).
38. Дидоренко С.А. Метафизика одного всеединства – М.: Московский философский фонд, 1999. – С. 229 (Didorenko S. *The Metaphysics of an All-unity*).
39. Замалеев А.Ф. Лекции по истории русской философии. – СПб.: Изд-во Сп-го ун-та, 1995. – С. 339 (Zamaleev A. *Lectures on History of Russian Philosophy*).
40. Зарубежная эстетика и теория литературы XIX-XX веков: трактаты, статьи, эссе. – М.: МГУ, 1987. – С.511 (*The Foreign Esthetics and Theory of Literature of the 19th–20th Centuries*).
41. Зверева Г.И. Онтология новой интеллектуальной истории // Вестник РГГУ, № 3. – М.: РГГУ, 1996. – С.196. (Zvereva G. *Ontology of the Recent Intellectual History*).

42. Зеньковский В.В. История русской философии в 2-х т. — Л.: Эго, 1991. (Zenkovsky V. *History of Russian Philosophy*, in 2 vols.) The first Russian edition was published in 1948–1950.
43. Зеньковский В.В. Русские мыслители и Европа. Критика европейской культуры у русских мыслителей // Зеньковский В.В. Русские мыслители и Европа — М.: Республика, 1997. — С. 37–51. (Zenkovsky V. *Russian Thinkers and Europe. A Critique of European Culture by Russian Thinkers* // Zenkovsky V. *Russian Thinkers and Europe*).
44. Ивановский В.Н. Методологическое введение в науку и философию, в 2-х т., Т. 1 — Минск, 1923. (Ivanovsky V. *Methodological Introduction into Science and Philosophy*, in 2 vols., vol. 1).
45. Ильин И.П. Постмодернизм от истоков до конца столетия — М.: Интрада, 1997. — С.256. (Ilyin I. *Postmodernism from the Sources up to the End of the Century*).
46. Ильин И.П. Постмодернизм. Словарь терминов — М.: ИНИОН РАН, Интрада, 2001. — С.384. (Ilyin I. *Postmodernism. Dictionary of Terms*).
47. Ильин И.П. Постструктурализм. Деконструктивизм. Постмодернизм. — М.: Интрада, 1996 — С.256. (Ilyin I. *Poststructuralism. Deconstructivism. Postmodernism*).
48. Кареев Н.И. Прожитое и пережитое — Ленинград: Изд-во Ленинградского университета, 1990. — С. 382 (Kareyev N. *My Past and Lived Through*).
49. Киейзик Л. Культурологические идеи Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. культурологии — Ростов на Дону, 1998. — С. 221. (Kiejzik L. *Culturological Ideas of Vladimir Solovyov*; PhD).
50. Киреевский И.В. Полное собрание сочинений, в 2-х т. — М.: Путь, 1911 (Kireevsky I. *Complete Collection of Works*).
51. Книга о Владимире Соловьеве. — М: Советский писатель, 1991. — С. 512. (*A Book about Vladimir Solovyov*).
52. Козырев А. Наукоучение Владимира Соловьева: К истории неудавшегося замысла // Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1997 г. /Отв. Редактор Колеров М./ — СПб.: Алетейя, 1997. — С. 5–68 (Kozyrev A. *Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy of Science: History of an Unsuccessful Project* // *Research on History of Russian Thought. The Year-book* — 1997).
53. Колеров М.А. /Отв. Редактор/ Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1997 г. — СПб.: Алетейя, 1997. — С. 320 (*Research on History of Russian Thought. Year-book-1997*).

54. Колеров М.А. /Отв. Редактор/ Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1998 – М.: ОГИ, 1998. – С. 543 (*Research on History of Russian Thought. Year-book-1998*).
55. Колетвинцев А.Н. Философия нравственности Вл Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М., 1991. – С.204. (Koletvintsev A. *Vl. Solovyov's Philosophy of Ethics*, PhD dissertation).
56. Кононенко Т. До pytannia hronologichnoi poslidovnosti tvoriv Platona u teoretychnii spadshchyni V.S. Soloviova // Проблемы философии – Киев: Лыбедь, 1991. – С. 9 – 15 (Kononenko T. *To the Question of the Chronological Order of Plato's Works in V.S. Solovyov's Theoretical Heritage* // *The Problems of Philosophy* – Kiev, 1991).
57. Корнилов С.В. Философия самосознания и творчества. Портреты русских мыслителей – СПб.: Изд-во С.Петербургского университета, 1998. – С. 223. (Kornilov S. *Philosophy of Self-knowledge and Creation. Portraits of Russian Thinkers*).
58. Круковский А. Владимир Соловьев как мыслитель и человек. К пятилетию его кончины – Вильна: Типография “Русский почин”, 1905. – С.45 (Krukovsky A. *Vladimir Solovyov as a Thinker and Human*).
59. Кутырев В.А. Естественное и искусственное: Борьба миров – Нижний Новгород: Изд-во “Нижний Новгород”, 1994. – С.200. (Kutyryov V. *The Natural and the Artificial. The Fight of the Worlds*).
60. Лапшова Н.И. К проблеме смысловой интерпретации философских определений В.Соловьева // Русская философия: новые решения старых проблем. Ч.1 – СПб, 1993. – С.41–44. (Lapshova N. *On the Problem of Interpretation of Philosophical Definitions by Vl. Solovyov* // *Russian Philosophy: New Solutions of Old Problems*).
61. Левин Ю.И. Инвариантные структуры в философском тексте: В.Соловьев // Серебряный век в России – М., 1993. – С. 5–86. (Levin Y. *Levin Y. Invariant Structures in Vl.Solovyov's Philosophic Text* // *The Silver Age in Russia*).
62. Литературный энциклопедический словарь – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1987. – С. 750. (*Ennciclopedic Dictionary of Literature*).
63. Лопатин Л.М. Памяти Вл.С.Соловьева // Книга о Владимире Соловьеве – М.: Советский писатель, 1991. – С.512. (Lopatin L. *In Memory of Vl. Solovyov* // *A Book about Vladimir Solovyov*).
64. Лопатин Л.М. Философские характеристики и речи – М.: Academia, 1995. – С. 328. (Lopatin L. *Philosophical Characterizations and Speeches*) (The first Russian edition published in 1911).
65. Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 720. (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov and his Time*).

66. Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев — М.: Мысль, 1994. — С. 230 (Losev A. *Vladimir Solovyov*) (The first Russian edition published in 1983).
67. Лосев А.Ф. Философия. Мифология. Культура. — М.: Политиздат, 1991. — С. 525. (Losev A. *Philosophy. Mythology. Culture*).
68. Лосский Н.О. История русской философии — М.: Советский писатель, 1991. — С. 479 (Lossky N. *History of Russian Philosophy*). The first edition was published in English in 1951.
69. Лукьянов С.М. О Вл.С. Соловьеве в его молодые годы. В 3-х т. — М.: Книга, 1990. (Lukyanov S. *On Vl. S. Solovyov in his Youth*).
70. Максимов М.В. Историософия Вл.Соловьева в отечественной и зарубежной философской мысли XX века /Диссертация на соискание ученой степени доктора философских наук/ — М.: Московский педагогический государственный университет, 1999. — С. 401. (Maksimov M. *Vl. Solovyov's Historiosophy in Russian and Foreign Thought of the 20th Century* /Advanced Doctoral Dissertation, Doktor Filosofskikh Nauk/.
71. Малахов В.С. Русская духовность и немецкая ученость. О немецких исследованиях истории русской мысли // Россия и Германия: Опыт философского диалога. — М.: Медиум, 1993. — С. 98. (Malakhov V. *Russian Spirituality and German Bildung. On German Researches of Russian Thought*).
72. Малахов В.С., Филатов В.П. /Составители и редакторы/ Современная западная философия. Словарь — М.: Изд-во политической литературы, 1991. — С.414. (*Modern Western Philosophy. Dictionary*).
73. Маслин М.А. /Редактор/ Русская философия. Словарь — М.: Республика, 1995. — С.655. (*Russian Philosophy. Dictionary*).
74. Материалы к биографии Вл. Соловьева (Из архива С.М. Лукьянова), № 1, С.М. Лукьянов. Запись бесед с Э.Э.Ухтомским //Российский архив, II, III, 1992. — С. 392 — 427 (*Materials for Biography of Vl. Solovyov (From the Archive of Sergei Lukyanov)*, N.1, S. Lukyanov, *Records of S. Lukyanov's Talks to E.Ukhtomsky*) // *Russian Archive*, II, III, 1992).
75. Межуев Б.В. Вл. С. Соловьев и петербургское общество 1890-х годов // Соловьевский сборник. Материалы международной конференции “В.С. Соловьев и его философское наследие” 28–30 августа 2000 / под редакцией И.В. Борисовой, А.П. Козырева/ — М.: Философия-Герменевтика, 2001. — С. 409–419. (Mezhuyev B. *Vl.Solovyov and St. Petersburg's Society of the 1890s* // *Solovyov Collection. Selected Papers of the International Conference “Vladimir Solovyov and his Philosophical*

- Heritage" held in Moscow, August 28 – 30. /Edited by I. Borisova, A. Kozyrev/).*
76. Межуев Б.В. К проблеме поздней “Эстетики” В.С.Соловьева (Опыт чтения газетных некрологов) // Исследования по истории русской мысли. Ежегодник за 1998 под ред. М.А.Колерова – М.: ОГИ, 1998. – С. 257–285. (Mezhuyev B. *On the Problem of V.I.Solovyov's Late Esthetics (Reading of the Obituaries in the Press)* // *Researches on the History of Russian Thought*, Yearbook-1998).
 77. Межуев Б.В. Отечественные истоки философии В.С.Соловьева (Социокультурный контекст 70–90-х годов 19 века): Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук – М.: МГУ, 1997. – С. 208. (Mezhuyev B. *The Russian Sources of Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy (Socio-cultural Context of the 70-90's of the 19th Century*; PhD dissertation).
 78. Мелетинский Е.М. /Главный редактор/ Мифологический словарь – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1991. – С. 736. (Meletinsky Y. /Editor-in-chief/ *Dictionary of Myth*).
 79. Мелетинский Е.М. Поэтика мифа – М.: Восточная литература, РАН, 2000. – С. 407. (Meletinsky Y. *Poetics of Myth*).
 80. Минц З.Г. Владимир Соловьев – поэт // Соловьев В.С. Стихотворения и шуточные пьесы – Ленинград: Советский писатель, 1974. – С. 5–56. (Mints Z. *Vladimir Solovyov – Poet* // Solovyov V. *Verses and Funny Plays*).
 81. Мочульский К.В. Гоголь. Соловьев. Достоевский – М.: Республика, 1995. – С.607. (Mochulsky K. *Gogol. Solovyov. Dostoyevsky*) The first Russian edition published in 1951.
 82. Никольский А.А. Русский Ориген XIX века Вл.С.Соловьев – СПб.: Наука, 2000. – С. 420. (Nikolsky A. *Russian Origen of the 19th Century Vladimir Solovyov*). This work was published in 1902 in magazine *Vera i Razum (Faith and Reason)*. I refer to the latest edition.
 83. Новикова Л.И., Сиземская И.Н. Русская философия истории – М.: Магистр, 1997. – С. 328 (Novikova L., Sizemskaya I. *Russian Philosophy of History*).
 84. Носов А. Реконструкция 12-го чтения по философии религии В.С. Соловьева // Символ, № 28 – Париж, 1992. – С. 245 – 258. (Nosov A. *The Reconstruction of the 12th Lecture on Philosophy of Religion by V.S. Solovyov* // *Simvol*, № 28).
 85. Осипова Л.Ф. К вопросу об эволюции эсхатологических концепций В.Соловьева // Вестник московского университета, № 3 – М.: МГУ, 1972. – С. 72. (Osipova L. *The Evolution of V.Solovyov's Eschatological Conception* // *Messenger of Moscow State University*, № 3, 1972).

86. От аллегории до ямба — Нижний Новгород.: Издательство педагогического университета, 1993. — С. 201. (*From Allegory to Iambus. Dictionary*).
87. Перепелкина Л.Д. Эстетика и литературная критика В.С. Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филол. наук — СПб.: Издательство Спб-ского университета, 1993. — С. 157 (Perepelkina L. *Aesthetics and Literary Criticism by Vladimir Solovyov*; PhD Dissertation).
88. Потапенко М. И. Эстетичность основных философских идей Владимира Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук — М.: МГУ, 1997. (Potapenko M. *The Aesthetic Quality of Vladimir Solovyov's Main Ideas*; PhD Dissertation).
89. Пригожин И. Философия нестабильности // Вопросы философии, М.: Наука, 1991, № 6. — С. 46–52. (Prigogine I. *Philosophy of Instability*).
90. Пропп В.Я. Морфология сказки. — М.: Наука, 1969. — С. 167. (Propp V. *Morphology of Fairy-Tale*) (The first Russian edition was printed in 1928).
91. Пушкин С.Н. Историософия русского консерватизма 19-го века: Диссертация на соискание степени доктора философских наук — Нижний Новгород, 1997. — С. 319. Pushkin S. *Historiosophy of Russian Conservatism of the 19th Century*. Dissertation of Doctor of Science (Advanced Doctor degree).
92. Радлов Э.Л. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творения — СПб., 1913. — С.154. (Radlov E. *Vladimir Solovyov. Life and Works*).
93. Розанов В.В. Из “Мимолетного” // Владимир Соловьев: Pro et contra. Личность и творчество Владимира Соловьева в оценке русских мыслителей и исследователей. Антология — Издательство Русского Христианского института, 2000. — С.896. (Rozanov V. *From Mimoletnoye // Vl. Solovyov: Pro et contra. Personality and Works of Vladimir Solovyov in Works of Russian Thinkers and Researchers* — St. Petersburg: Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute Press, 2000. — p. 896.).
94. Розанов В.В. Природа и история. Сборник статей. — СПб., 1900. (Rozanov V. *Nature and History. Collection of Works*).
95. Россия и Германия: Опыт философского диалога. — М.: Медиум, 1993. — С. 352. (*Russia and Germany. An Experience of a Philosophical Dialogue*).
96. Роцинский С.Б. Владимир Соловьев и западная мысль. Критика. Примирение. Синтез — Элиста: АПП “Джангар”, 1999. — С.176 (Rotsinsky S. *Vladimir Solovyov and Western Thought*).

97. Руднев В.П. Словарь культуры XX века — М.: Аграф, 1997. — С. 381(Rudnev V. *Dictionary of Culture of the 20th Century*).
98. Савин Ю.Г. Гносеология истины в трудах Вл.Соловьева. — М. Международная академия наук. Институт проблем ноокоsmологии. 1996. — С. 63.(Savin Y. *Epistemology of Truth in Vl.Solovyov's Works*).
99. Саводник В. Ф. Поэзия Владимира Соловьева // Русский вестник, № 11, СПб., 1900. (Savodnik A. *Vladimir Solovyov's Poetry*).
100. Свиридова Г.И. Вопросы государственного устройства в наследии В.Соловьева // Российская государственность: этапы становления и развития. Ч.2 — Кострома, 1993. — С.31—36 (Sviridova G. *Problems of State in V. Solovyov's works // Russian State. The Stages of the Process of Development. Part 2*).
101. Сербиненко В.В. Владимир Соловьев: Запад, Восток и Россия. — М.: Наука, 1994. — С.203. (Serbinenko V. *Vladimir Solovyov: West, East and Russia*).
102. Смердов И.В. Автор и лирический персонаж в поэзии Владимира Соловьева // Аспирант. Сборник научных трудов аспирантов НГЛУ— Нижний Новгород: НГЛУ, 1996. — С. 31—36. (Smerdov I. *The Author and Lyrical Personage in Vladimir Solovyov's Poetry*).
103. Смирнова З. В. Историко-философские проблемы в трудах И.В.Киреевского // Историко-философский ежегодник — М.: Наука, 1997. — С. 276—294. (Smirnova Z. *The Issues of History of Philosophy in the Works of I.V. Kireevsky // History of Philosophy. Yearbook — 96*).
104. Соболев А.В. К истории религиозно философского общества памяти Владимира Соловьева // Историко-философский ежегодник — М: Наука, 1994. — С. 102—114. (Sobolev A. *On the History of the Religious and Philosophical Vladimir Solovyov Memorial Society // History of Philosophy. Yearbook-92*).
105. Современное зарубежное литературоведение (страны Западной Европы и США): концепции, школы, термины. Энциклопедический справочник. — М.: Интрада, ИНИОН, 1996. — С. 63—79. (*Modern Western Literary Studies: Conceptions, Schools, Terms. Dictionary*).
106. Соловьев В.С. Письма (под ред. Э.Л. Радлова) в 4-х т. — СПб.: Общественная польза, Время — 1908—1923. (Solovyov V. *Letters, in 4 vols.*).
107. Соловьев В.С. Собрание сочинений, в 14-ти т. — Брюссель: Жизнь с богом, 1969. (Solovyov V. *Collection of Works, in 14 vols.*).
108. Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т. — М.: Мысль, 1988.(Solovyov V. *Works, in 2 vols.*).

109. Соловьев В.С. Сочинения в 2-х т. — М.: Правда, 1989. (Solovyov V. *Works*, in 2 vols.).
110. Соловьев С.М. Владимир Соловьев. Жизнь и творческая эволюция — М.: Республика, 1997. — С.431. (Solovyov S. M. *The Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov*).
111. Спиров В.В. Философия истории Вл.Соловьева в ее развитии и преемственности /Исторические судьбы одной теократической утопии/: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук — М.: МГУ, 1969. — С.209. (Spirov V. *Vl.Solovyov's Philosophy of History in Its Development and Receptivity /Historical Fate of a Theocratic Utopia / PhD dissertation*).
112. Столярова Т.Ф., Пантин В.И. Воспламененная душа. Вольные размышления о Владимире Соловьеве — М.: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2000. — С. 320 (Stolyarova T., Pantin V. *The Inflamed Soul*).
113. Теория метафоры — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — С. 320 (*Theory of Metaphor*).
114. Творчість Володимира Соловйова в контексті культури срібного віку. Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції — Дрогобич, 1998. — С. 240. (*Vladimir Solovyov's Works in the Context of Culture of the "Silver Age"*).
115. Тодоров Ц. Понятие литературы // Семиотика — М.: Радуга, 1983. — С.635. (Todorov T. *The Concept of Literature*).
116. Томашевский Б.В. Теория литературы. Поэтика — М.: Аспект Пресс, 1996. — С.334 (Tomashevsky B. *Theory of Literature. Poetics*). The first Russian edition was printed in 1925.
117. Трубецкой Е.Н. Миросозерцание Владимира Соловьева, в 2-х т. — М.: Медиум, 1995. (Trubetskoi E. *Vladimir Solovyov's World-View*). The first edition was published in 1913.
118. Туренко Ю.Д. Критика историко-философской концепции Вл.Соловьева: Диссертация на соискание степени канд. филос. наук. — М., 1971. — С. 228. (Turenko Y. *The Critique of Vladimir Solovyov's Historio-philosophical Conception*; PhD dissertation).
119. Успенский Б.А. Поэтика композиции. Структура художественного текста и типология композиционных форм. — М.: Искусство, 1973 — С. 193. (Uspensky B. *Poetics of Composition. The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of Forms of Composition*).
120. Уткина Н.Ф. Проблемы “Теоретической философии” В.С. Соловьева // Историко-философский ежегодник — М.: Наука, 1988. —

- С. 166–179. (Utkina N. *V.Solovyov's Philosophy (The Second Article) // History of Philosophy. Yearbook-88*).
121. Уткина Н.Ф. Философия В.С. Соловьева (Статья первая) // Историко-философский ежегодник – М.: Наука, 1994. – С. 115–140. (Utkina N. *V.Solovyov's Philosophy (First Article) // History of Philosophy. Yearbook-92*).
122. Уткина Н.Ф. Философия В.С. Соловьева (Статья вторая) // Историко-философский ежегодник – М.: Наука, 1994. – С. 91–121. (Utkina N. *V.Solovyov's Philosophy (Second Article) // History of Philosophy. Yearbook-93*).
123. Фараджев К.В. Владимир Соловьев. Мифология образа – Москва: Аграф, 2000. – С. 155. (Faradzhev K. *Vladimir Solovyov: Mythology of Image*).
124. Федоров В.А. История России, 1861–1917 гг. – М.: Высшая школа, 1998. – С. 384 (Fyodorov V. *History of Russia, 1861–1917*).
125. Философия Шеллинга в России /под редакцией В. Пустарнакова/ – СПб.: Издательство Русского Христианского гуманитарного института, 1998. – С.527 (*Schelling's Philosophy in Russia /Edited by V.Pustarnakov/*).
126. Философский словарь Владимира Соловьева – Ростов на Дону: Феникс, 1997. – С.463. (*Philosophic Dictionary of Vladimir Solovyov*).
127. Хализев В.Е. Теория литературы. – М. : Высшая школа, 1999. – С. 398. (Khalizev V. *Theory of Literature*).
128. Хоружий С.С. Наследие Владимира Соловьева сто лет спустя // Журнал Московской патриархии, № 11 – М., 2000. – С. 69–83 (Khoruzhy S. *The Heritage of Vladimir Solovyov Hundred Years Later*).
129. Хоружий С.С. О старом и новом – СПб.: Алетейя, 2000. – С.457. (Khoruzhy S. *On the Old and the New*).
130. Хоружий С.С. После перерыва. Пути русской философии – СПб.: Алетейя, 1994. – С. 447. (Khoruzhy S. *After the Break. The Ways of Russian Philosophy*).
131. Честертон Г.К. Фома Аквинский // Вечный человек – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – С.544. (Chesterton G. *Thomas Aquinas*).
132. Шапошников Л.Е. Философские портреты – Н.Новгород, 1993. – С.222. (Shaposhnikov L. *Philosophic Portraits*).
133. Шкловский В. О теории прозы – М.: Федерация, 1929. – С. 159. (Shklovsky V. *On the Theory of Prose*).
134. Шохин В.К. В.С. Соловьев, индийская философия и проблемы компаративистики // Историко-философский ежегодник – М.:

- Мартис, 1996. — С. 91–121. (Shokhin V. V. *Solovyov, Indian Philosophy and the Problems of Comparativistics // History of Philosophy. Yearbook-95*).
135. Эйхенбаум Б.М. Как сделана “Шинель” Гоголя (*Wie Gogol's “Mantel” gemacht ist*) // *Texte der Russischen Formalisten*, Band I — Мюнхен: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1969. — S. 122–159.
136. Язык и наука конца 20 века. Сборник статей — М.: РГГУ, 1995. — С.432. (*Language and Science of the End of the 20th Century*).
137. Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика // Структурализм: “за” и “против” — М.: Прогресс, 1975. — С. 193 — 231. (Jakobson R. *Linguistics and Poetics*).
138. Ященко А.С. Философия права Владимира Соловьева — СПб.: Алетея, 1999. — С. 17–52. (Yashchenko A. *Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophy of Law*). The first Russian edition was published in 1912.

Igor Smerdov

**THE PHILOSOPHICAL NARRATIVE
OF VLADIMIR SOLOVYOV**

**An Application of Narrative Analysis
to Russian Classical Philosophy: a Case-Study
of *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*
and Other Works by Vladimir Solovyov**